

tion the Sergeant at Arms and his assistants, the Parliamentarian, the Secretary of the Senate, Mr. Biddle, whom we all love and who has been so courteous to all of us, and also the doorkeepers of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I want to make one brief statement before I move that the Senate adjourn.

I am very grateful for all the kind things which have been said about me as the majority leader. It is a rather difficult job, as anyone who has been around this desk can well realize. But, after all, someone has to do the work; and I have done the best I could.

ADJOURNMENT TO NOVEMBER 27, 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in accordance with the terms of House Concurrent Resolution 287, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday, November 27, 1950.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under House Concurrent Resolution 287, to Monday, November 27, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 22, 1950:

##### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Robert T. Creasey, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor.

##### FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Stephen J. Spingarn, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Trade Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from September 26, 1946, vice Ewin Lamar Davis, deceased.

##### COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

H. Tucker Gratz, of Honolulu, T. H., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 32, with headquarters at Honolulu, T. H., to fill an existing vacancy.

##### UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

James T. Gooch, of Arkansas, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Arkansas. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 27, 1950.

Respass S. Wilson, of Arkansas, to be United States attorney for the western district of Arkansas. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 13, 1950.

##### UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Noble V. Miller, of Arkansas, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Arkansas. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 13, 1950.

##### UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

*To be scientist (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance*  
Louis Block

*To be senior assistant scientists (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance*

Bill H. Hoyer  
Robert J. Fitzgerald  
William F. Durham

*To be senior assistant nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance*

Mary R. Lester

KCVI—891

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 23, 1950:

##### UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Hon. Louie W. Strum, of Florida, to be United States circuit judge, fifth circuit.

##### UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Bryan Simpson, of Florida, to be United States district judge for the southern district of Florida.

##### UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

James T. Gooch to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Arkansas.

Respass S. Wilson to be United States attorney for the western district of Arkansas.

John Norwood McKay to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Louisiana.

##### UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Noble V. Miller to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Arkansas.

##### PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION IN THE REGULAR CORPS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

*To be assistant pharmacists, effective date of acceptance*

Philbrook H. Knight  
Boris J. Osheroff

*To be assistant scientists, effective date of acceptance*

Jerome L. Singer  
William L. Jenkins

*To be senior assistant nurse officer*

Margaret M. Sweeney

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR CORPS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

*To be scientist, effective date of acceptance*  
Louis Block

*To be senior assistant scientists, effective date of acceptance*

Bill H. Hoyer  
Robert J. Fitzgerald  
William F. Durham

*To be senior assistant nurse officer, effective date of acceptance*

Mary R. Lester.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou infinite and eternal God through whose mercies we are spared, and by whose power we are daily sustained, hitherto Thou hast blessed us and we have found Thee faithful unto all Thy promises.

On this day we would render unto Thee the tribute of our heartfelt gratitude for the high and holy privilege we have had of walking and working together in the service of our God, our country, and humanity.

We pray that Thou wilt bestow the benediction of Thy peace and the diadem of Thy praise, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant," upon our President, our Speaker, the chosen representatives of our Republic, and all who have served our Nation during this session of Congress, in whatever capacity.

We commend and commit one another to Thy love and care. We know not what

the future has in store for us, but we will trust Thee and not be afraid, for we have the glad assurance that, as our days, so also shall be our strength and that no needed blessing wilt Thou withhold from us if we do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with the Lord.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6355. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Richmond, Calif.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 450. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by providing for the delegation of certain authority of the Administrator, and for other purposes;

S. 3504. An act to promote the development of improved transport aircraft by providing for the operation, testing, and modification thereof; and

S. 3960. An act to amend subsection (b) of section 10 of the act of June 26, 1884, as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 599 (b)).

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8920) entitled "An act to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes."

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

#### ENFORCEMENT OF INTERNAL SECURITY ACT, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons given by President Truman in his message vetoing the Communist-control bill was that the bill as passed would be unenforceable.

It appears to me that he is already paving the way for another unenforced policy for which he is famous in other cases where bills were passed over his veto. I am particularly referring to the lackadaisical attitude the President has taken about enforcing such legislation as the Taft-Hartley Act.

Now, it is the principal duty of our Chief Executive to enforce all Federal

laws whether he likes them or not. I hope that if the President has an unenforcement policy of the Communist-control bill in mind, he will reconsider his position, as we certainly need not only the law controlling communism in this country, we need strict enforcement.

A law is worthless unless it is enforced.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

In compliance with the request contained in the resolution of the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring therein), I return herewith H. R. 1025, entitled "An act for the relief of Waymon H. Massey."

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 23, 1950.

CONTINUED CONFUSION AS TO ADJOURNMENT AND DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS FOODS

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, the confusion which now prevails as to what the actual situation will be with reference to any recess points up, I think, the wisdom of the most careful kind of consideration of any future adjournment or recess resolution.

While those of us who tried yesterday to obtain consideration of an amendment to provide the vital alternative of reassembling on the third day after the Members are notified to reassemble by the four leaders of the administration in the Congress lost that fight, I believe it will serve a most useful purpose in making the record clear and pointing up the wisdom of the retention by Congress of its power to act independently in any emergency.

I think few will deny that it is conceivable that a situation could arise involving a most serious threat to this Nation, when the people and the Congress would want prompt legislative action, but the Executive would disagree and refuse to recall the Congress. Of course, we all hope there will be no such situation between now and November 27, yet the form of the resolution leaves it exclusively within the power of the President to determine whether Congress can reassemble before November 27. It is true that there is still opportunity in the other body to amend the pending resolution but I am under no illusion as to the possibility that this will be done, particularly in terms of the situation which seems to prevail there now.

However, I am confident that with this situation such as it is, and with the full facts now before the Congress, it will not again permit itself to be maneuvered

into such an abandonment of its direct and clear responsibilities.

This confusion also jeopardizes the possibility of enactment in the other body of H. R. 9313. As you know, that bill passed the House August 22 unanimously. Earlier this month it appeared very unlikely that the Senate committee would take any action on the bill. However, on September 14, the President sent a letter to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, a copy of which I placed in the Appendix of the RECORD at page A6633 on September 14. In that letter he pointed out what I have been pointing out ever since February, that it is no more expensive to ship these food commodities than to carry them in storage for months on end, and that we ought at once to take the necessary steps to get these surpluses where they will do some good.

On September 15 the bill was reported to the other body favorably and on that day was placed on the schedule of business which must be completed before any recess.

I have computed the amount of money paid for storage on 16 food commodities between February 2, when I filed H. R. 7137 which would have accomplished the same purposes as H. R. 9313, to June 30. It amounts to the staggering sum of \$21,088,580.40, which is a completely unnecessary and indefensible waste of the taxpayers' money. Taking that as the average continuing cost, and it certainly is no less because of the sharply increased holdings reported up to September 11, this waste now amounts to \$26,188,580.40. If the recess occurs without final legislative action, there will be 64 days between tonight and Monday noon, November 27. The additional loss in that period will not be less than \$3,840,000. Of course, it cannot be recaptured, but it is tragic to think that it will have been spent so uselessly when we have passed a bill sharply increasing the taxes of everybody. It is even more shocking to contemplate that when we think of how much vitally needed war equipment could have been purchased with such a sum.

Of course, it is equally clear that with each day lost, the probability of spoilage greatly increases. That probability of spoilage can become a reality. If it occurs, a great majority of the American people will be rightly shocked and properly wrathful.

Because I am so seriously concerned about this, I have sent another wire to the President, and I want now to include a copy of it:

SEPTEMBER 23, 1950.

The PRESIDENT,  
The White House,  
Washington, D. C.:

As you know, H. R. 9313 was on September 15 placed on the schedule of business to be definitely completed before any recess. With the situation existing at this moment in the Senate it is not clear that any definite action will be taken. In the light of the accumulated losses for unnecessary storage and the probability that at least \$3,840,000 would be the amount of the continued waste between now and November 27 and with the threat of extensive spoilage, I do urge you to make every possible effort to see that this bill

is passed so that you may sign it and these wholesome food commodities can be promptly shipped to people who could and would eat them but cannot afford to buy them.

JOHN W. HESELTON,  
Member of Congress.

GENERAL MACARTHUR

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I rise not for the purpose of stimulating debate on an issue I think has been well settled by the speeches made in this House by the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], and by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], on August 31, but to try to clarify some possible misunderstanding as a result of that discussion.

After Mr. McCORMACK had pointed out that the late President Roosevelt had called back into the service a great general, General MacArthur, and had ordered him out of Corregidor and then placed him in command of forces in the South Pacific, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio raised an important question as to the action of President Truman in having General MacArthur to withdraw his statement on Formosa which had been prepared for the convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. BROWN said, and I quote:

First of all, the people are wondering just why the President of the United States should be giving orders to the Commander in Chief of the United Nations Forces in Korea, for that is the position and that is the title General MacArthur now holds.

The distinguished Ohioan further stressed that MacArthur is not serving as an officer of the United States Army, but as Commander in Chief of the United Nations Forces.

I think it can be well verified that President Truman has high regard for General MacArthur.

In correcting what might be a misunderstanding, I want to remind my colleague that General MacArthur holds three titles, all of which resulted from actions by President Truman. After World War II the division of authority in our Pacific forces was eliminated, and President Truman named General MacArthur the commanding general, United States forces in the Far East. Subsequently it was President Truman who insisted, over Russian opposition, that MacArthur be named supreme commander, Allied Powers, occupation forces in Japan. Furthermore, General MacArthur was appointed chief of the United Nations command in Korea by President Truman with the title of commanding general, United Nations forces in Korea.

My information is that the United Nations requested the President to appoint the United Nations commander, and that Mr. Truman promptly appointed MacArthur.



Perhaps this would be a good opportunity also to point out that the United Nations Forces in Korea, and the action of the United Nations in Korea are separate and apart from the action of the United States with regard to Formosa. The United Nations has not taken any action relative to Formosa, but the orders to General MacArthur as commanding general of the United States forces in the Far East were to the effect that Formosa should be protected and neutralized by American naval forces.

So we find this great general for whom we all have respect and admiration occupying three important positions. I merely wanted to call the attention of the House to this fact, and since the President is the Commander in Chief of the United States Armed Forces that he was in his full rights when he ordered General MacArthur, the commanding general of the United States forces in the Far East, to withdraw his statement on Formosa.

In recent days we have all been heartened over the prospects of an early victory in Korea because of the bold offensive conceived and launched by General MacArthur.

This military move has added luster to his name as a great general.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not understand what the gentleman is referring to. I have great faith and confidence in the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. May I say to the gentleman from Ohio that in a colloquy between the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], on August 31, with reference to the titles held by General MacArthur, a check of the RECORD seems to show that there might be some misunderstanding or misinterpretation about three distinct titles which General MacArthur actually holds now, one as commander in chief of the United States forces in the Pacific—

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman from Tennessee suggest or request permission to correct the remarks that the gentleman from Ohio made on that occasion?

Mr. PRIEST. No; the gentleman from Tennessee is merely making a clarifying statement following up what took place between the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And the gentleman does not ask permission to change the colloquy in any way?

Mr. PRIEST. None whatsoever.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And the remarks made by the gentleman from Massachusetts and the remarks made by the gentleman from Ohio will remain as they are?

Mr. PRIEST. I assure the gentleman that as far as I am concerned no change whatsoever will be made.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

#### THE INTERNAL SECURITY BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill as an amendment to, and substitute for, the bill (H. R. 9490) for the control of subversive activities, passed by the House yesterday, over the President's veto, and now pending in the Senate.

The proposed bill incorporates provisions of the original bill effective in controlling Communists and communistic activities in the United States and omits features objected to by the President in his message to the House returning the bill without approval.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD to include the proposed bill and to include also editorials from various papers approving the President's veto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUCAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in one include an editorial and in another certain extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address delivered by the president of the American Bar Association.

Mr. GOSSETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech delivered by the president of the American Bar Association.

Mr. POAGE (at the request of Mr. PICKETT) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution adopted by the American Legion of Tennessee at its recent convention.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therein a tabulation of his voting and attendance record during the second session of the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Peoria Star.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from News Week.

Mr. RHODES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. WALSH) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address made by Trygve Lie, Secretary General of the United Nations, in the city of Chicago, on September 8, 1950, at the Stevens Hotel.

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include copies of the news letters which he has been sending to his constituents.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Reader's Digest.

Mr. CANNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Reader's Digest; and in a second extension to include an article on the distinguished service of Mr. Dodd, formerly of the Department of Agriculture.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares a recess subject to the call of the Chair, the bells to be rung 15 minutes before the expiration of the recess.

(Accordingly, at 12 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m. the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.)

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 287. Concurrent resolution relative to adjournment of both Houses on Saturday, September 23, 1950, and that they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Monday, November 27, 1950; and

H. Con. Res. 288. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions.

The message also announced that the Senate having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 9490) entitled "An act to protect the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities by requiring registration of Commu-

nist organizations, and for other purposes; returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, and passed by the House of Representatives on reconsideration of the same, and that the said bill pass, two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative.

#### RECORD OF THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all share a feeling that in the past 21 months of almost continuous sessions we have been living and working in a new, difficult, and dangerous era.

Grave events urgently pressed upon our deliberations. The sweeping variety of foreign and domestic problems demanding prompt determination probably was greater than faced by any Congress in the Nation's history.

Though our labors have been heavy and our responsibilities great, let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the achievements of the Eighty-first Congress have been monumental. Our duties, I am proud to say, have been so discharged as to fully justify our democratic legislative system.

Only under the processes of free discussion and majority consent, by which the people of this free Nation govern their affairs, is it possible to express the popular will, to reconcile the differences of opposing political convictions, and to emerge, as we have done, with a constructive program. The domestic phase of this program was aimed at the goal of the Democratic Party—the improvement of American family life. The foreign phase of this program is aimed at the protection of the American way of life for the American family, and to affirmatively and effectively exercise the powers of our Government for future permanent peace.

To this result all of us have contributed in some measure. I want to thank each of my colleagues for their devotion to duty during these long months of arduous work. It is established by the record that the minority opposition as a whole took vigorous steps to thwart enactment of much of this constructive program.

In my humble judgment, the Eighty-first Congress will be recorded in history as that which, for the first time, fully supported the United States in its new position of world leadership in the age-old struggle for peace.

This Congress succeeded the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress, which had been repudiated by the voters in the 1948 elections. After 2 years of Republican control of the legislative branch of our Government, the voters returned the Democratic Party to power in all branches. I think this demonstration

on the part of the people justifies the claim that they appreciate that the Democratic Party is the party of the people.

As this Congress convened in January 1949, war-weary and war-worried people everywhere found the peace for which they yearn endangered by the rise and spread of a tyrannical foreign force.

Carrying on its campaign by force, by propaganda, by conspiracy, by oppression and subjugation of weaker nations, communism was spreading its tentacles of police-state power across the face of Europe, just as now it is on the march in the broad sweeps of Asia.

Not only does communism do violence to the accepted precepts of international law and comity among nations, but it seeks to enforce a Godless creed. It subordinates human dignity and the rights of the individual to vicious state control. It undermines and destroys the family, the basic unit of civilization and of the way of life we cherish, just as it is destructive of normal relations among the family of nations. It attacks organized religion of any kind.

That is the menace we face; that was the outstanding problem confronting the Eighty-first Congress. We had a choice. We could have pawned our freedom on the altar of appeasement and bowed to conditions of an encroaching dictatorship bent on world domination, or taken a stand as the champion and guardian of the cause of liberty throughout the world.

You know our choice. It will be to the everlasting credit of the Eighty-first Congress that we had the courage to accept this challenge and to commit ourselves to the solemn undertaking of courageous opposition to this threat.

When the program enacted by this Congress is considered as a whole, it will be found that the variety of measures dovetail into a well thought out pattern designed to strengthen this Nation's position abroad and to strengthen ourselves through better living conditions.

Despite this, our program was fought every step of the way by a willful and vocal minority in the Congress. Men of minute vision and of small faith shrank from paying the high price in fortitude and funds which freedom exacts from those willing to preserve it. Their opposition, fortunately, could not prevail over the majority sentiment.

I say that freedom exacts a high price in courage and sacrifice. The American people have paid that price from the beginning of the idea for this Republic. They cherish freedom and always will fight for it.

If the unexpected outbreak of armed conflict in Korea had any good effect, whatsoever, it brought stark reality to those skeptical, blind, and protesting among us, who have opposed the administration's program to marshal our matériel and human resources to the maximum degree of national strength.

Every major step of progress in this supreme effort was achieved only in the face of obstructive and pettifogging tactics. All too frequently, we were treated to the spectacle of member after member of the opposition rising in his place

to denounce and vilify the officials charged by the people with the responsibility of carrying out these difficult and often disagreeable tasks. Support finally given to the required measures was given grudgingly.

The vote by which this Congress granted President Truman's request for legislation to permit the appointment of that great statesman and military genius, Gen. George C. Marshall, as Secretary of Defense, typifies the narrow partisan outlook of a great majority of the Republican Party in Congress toward all our national problems.

In General Marshall we find a man whose whole career has demonstrated ability in excess of the generally accepted qualifications of military leaders, beginning with his being commissioned in the Army from civilian life. General Marshall proved his capacity as a civilian administrator as Secretary of State and as chairman of the American Red Cross.

That General Marshall cherished the conviction that the role of the military in a democracy is subordinate to civilian command is well recognized by the military men with whom he has served. General Marshall recognizes completely that under our form of Government the military serves—does not dominate. General Marshall has proven that he believes the soldier's job in the United States is to serve the people and not have the people serve the military. Since he has left his military post, he has been called to serve his country three times in civilian capacity. Being a good soldier, he responded to his Government's call.

Yet, in the midst of a new crisis, and as General Marshall stood ready to answer a new call of service, 100 House Republicans voted against legislation to permit him to serve. Twenty-seven House Republicans put politics aside and voted for the good of the Nation.

In the Senate there were 20 Republicans, including GOP leaders, who voted against General Marshall. Ten Senate Republicans lifted themselves above politics.

Democrats voted 193 to 5 in the House and 37 to 1 in the Senate to clear the way for President Truman to name General Marshall the new Secretary of Defense.

It is unfortunate for the Republican Party that it has continued to play politics as usual throughout the Eighty-first Congress. Their actions clearly demonstrated that its members are unadjusted and refuse to be reconciled to the new state of armed vigilance in which this Nation obviously must live as long as despotic aggressors and their fanatic hordes wander the earth.

The record of proceedings on almost every important bill will bear me out. For that record, each individual Member is answerable to his constituents in the coming elections as well as his conscience.

Great strides have been made by this country in the last 5 years under the dynamic leadership of President Harry S. Truman.

Ability, courage, and decision in foreign affairs and in the domestic field



have been the three outstanding characteristics of President Truman. The actions he has taken and the programs he has advocated have strengthened this Nation and have strengthened friendly people over the world and have revived the hopes for freedom of the oppressed and enslaved peoples in lands now dominated by Communists.

The Eighty-first Congress is the first postwar Congress to give the President a well-rounded program to meet the crisis created by Communists in the Kremlin.

Because the United States was the strongest democracy, it had to assume the leadership in the world-wide contest between freedom and communism. President Truman possessed the ability and vision to recognize this, the courage to lead this Nation and other democracies in this contest and the decisiveness necessary to meet each situation as it developed.

This Congress has given President Truman the tools to do the job.

It was under the courageous leadership of President Truman that Greece was saved from Red guerrillas; that Communist infiltration drives to take over France and Italy were thwarted and threatened blows at Iran and Turkey were turned.

This Congress carried forward with the President's program to combat the spread of communism through extension of the Marshall plan, the ratification of the Atlantic Pact, the enactment of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act.

Through these steps, we have woven a pattern that has revived western Europe economically and have given our freedom loving friends in that and other areas military might to resist the unceasing pressure from the Kremlin.

Relief and rehabilitation from the ravages of World War II was our first goal. That was accomplished. Then came economic recovery. That was achieved. Now rearming is on its way. That will be attained. Congress approved the principle of President Truman's point 4 program to aid underdeveloped countries. That also is on its way.

These unprecedented steps were taken to bolster the morale of the free nations and peoples over the world and to restore their will to resist new aggression. They were needed to give the world the leadership it sought from this giant of the west—Uncle Sam. I am happy that this Nation possessed the power and wisdom to support this program, which is in such contrast to the tactics employed by the Moscow Government for world domination. Our program is for peace and freedom. Never before has any country at any time approached the problem of world peace with such a program as this.

It is broader than that peace program conceived by the great President Woodrow Wilson, a Democrat of highest aims. It is, however, historic that within a span of a generation, the United States of America has completed a historic cycle. It was a dark day in the world when the Sixty-sixth, a Republican Congress, back in 1920, rejected the covenant of the League of Nations. For that short-

sightedness, which reversed the cause of peace for 30 years, we paid dearly with a Second World War.

Every part of our program is designed to prevent a third world war. Our goal is to convince the Kremlin and the Politburo that aggression will be resisted; that war is unprofitable; that the United Nations, and not the battlefield, shall be the only and final form for settlement of differences between nations.

World affairs have overshadowed our work, but in dealing with them Congress has accomplished much on the domestic front of which it may be proud.

We have authorized the greatest peace-time program for the enlargement of our Armed Forces to safeguard this Nation and to discourage any aggressor. We have passed laws to protect our internal security against spies, saboteurs, and traitors.

Congress improved and expanded the Social Security Act to increase its benefits and to bring 10,000,000 more citizens under its protective provisions.

The first comprehensive and long-range housing program was enacted. It will make it possible for hundreds of thousands of families in lower and middle-income brackets to obtain adequate housing for the first time.

We raised the minimum level of wages and improved the employment standards of millions of workers in industries engaged in interstate commerce.

Programs of vast benefit to the farmers have been enacted to assure a fair return above the cost of production, ample storage space for their surplus, crop insurance, a world market for wheat, extension of the rural electrification program to the installation of telephone lines and removal of the tax on oleomargarine. The farmers must have price supports we have enacted to insure buying power to keep industry and labor at work.

When the Eighty-first Congress succeeded the Republican Eightieth Congress in January 1949, there were fears that the Nation was headed for a depression. Business activity and employment declined to the lowest point since the war. But soon thereafter, the people began to see the light on the administration's program. And 1949 turned out to be a great business year.

Since then conditions at home have continued to improve. The entire national economy has been growing. Business, labor, and agriculture, all are enjoying unprecedented prosperity. Employment is at a new high peak and national income this year will exceed even that of the biggest war years.

While Congress was burdened with many problems, it did not overlook our war veterans. Legislation liberalizing payments to veterans and their dependents for various types of disability and simplifying procedures of the Veterans' Administration was placed on the law books.

This Congress approved the most sweeping reorganization of the executive branch of the Government ever undertaken. Overlapping agencies and duplicating functions were eliminated. Economies that will save taxpayers billions of dollars were accomplished.

Programs for utilization of our great natural resources through reclamation, irrigation, water power, and flood-control projects have been authorized and are under way, transforming vast areas of parched and useless western plains into green and productive acres for millions of new families.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the whole work of this Eighty-first Congress has been devoted to making these United States a better and a happier place of abode for its citizens, to improving their standards of living, and to assuring their security and welfare. This is our code—to help the greatest American unit—the American family. A strong family life means strong government. Weak family life means weak government.

In no other way can it be illustrated to the rest of the world that freedom and democracy spell peace and contentment for those who live under this system, as contrasted to the slavery and oppression that is the fate of the victims of totalitarianism.

We have striven, and I believe we have succeeded as never before, to bring to fruition those conditions envisaged by George Washington when he wished for all who dwell in this land that "everyone shall sit in safety under his own vine and fig-tree and there shall be none to make him afraid."

Let's look at the record.

#### EMERGENCY PROGRAM

The dawn of June 25, 1950, marked another day that will live in infamy in the annals of international treachery. With this sudden unprovoked attack upon a new independent nation, created under the auspices of the United Nations, communism removed its mask and turned from the stealthy ways of subversion to open armed aggression.

This Congress quickly responded to the needs of the hour. With a promptness which demonstrated the ability of democracy to function in a crisis, this Congress enacted legislation to put our defense machinery and our economy on emergency footing. This speed was in response to the request of the United Nations Security Council to halt the invader.

We removed limitations on the size of our armed services.

We extended current enlistments for another year.

We established authority for exercise of controls over critical materials and for speeding up defense production. We provided for price and wage controls should they become necessary.

We provided \$17,000,000,000 in additional appropriations for our Armed Forces for arming our allies of the 12 North Atlantic Pact nations.

We enacted a \$4,700,000,000 tax measure to raise revenues to pay part of these costs of the action in Korea in the interest of enforcing peace.

To guard against possible sneak attacks we enacted laws giving the executive branch of the Government authority to control the movement of foreign ships in our home waters and the movements of aircraft over our cities and defense-production centers.

All of this we did within a few weeks, superimposed upon our normal program of work.

#### INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Collective security, a common effort to maintain peace and to safeguard freedom everywhere in the world, is the goal of all free nations.

Obviously, European nations which emerged from World War II with their economies bankrupt, their industries ravaged, and their morale shattered could not contribute immediately to this end. In fact, their weakness make them vulnerable to the advances of communism.

The Eighty-first Congress, by enactment of foreign economic assistance bills in its first and second sessions, has provided the authority and the means for continuance of the Marshall plan through its second and third years.

Europe's rehabilitated condition today gives eloquent proof of the wisdom of our course. The productive capacity of the 16 Marshall plan nations has been restored. Very nearly normal trade relations have been resumed.

By helping European nations and people to help themselves we have also strengthened their will to resist the inroads of communism.

With the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and of the President's authority to negotiate such agreements, to June 1951, this Congress gave impetus to the sound and beneficial free flow of world commerce. Hampering restrictions which the Republican Eightieth Congress imposed upon the administrators of this act have been removed.

Companion to the economic stability of Europe is the program of military strengthening of the nations signatory to the North Atlantic Treaty. By that treaty, launched and ratified within the framework of the United Nations, notice was served upon communism and imperialism that these nations would stand together to preserve their freedom.

Under laws passed by this Congress in our first and second sessions, we are today supplying these allies with arms and equipment for their common defense against any new aggression by Russia or its satellite nations.

The military and economic aid programs include one or both types of assistance to Turkey, Greece, Iran, South Korea, the Philippines, and to non-Communist areas of China.

Another great accomplishment of the Eighty-first Congress in the international field was enactment of a displaced persons law which wipes from the statute books the discredited and discriminatory provisions written by the Republican Eightieth Congress.

Under the new law, the number of these unfortunate displaced persons to be admitted to the United States is increased from 205,000 to 359,000. Eligibility qualifications were liberalized. This was an action not only humanitarian, but consistent with our long tradition of granting asylum to the oppressed and the homeless who, in the past, have contributed to the building of America.

Authorization by this Congress of an initial program of technical assistance for underdeveloped areas of the world set an historic precedent. It was recognition of the logic and the soundness of President Truman's famous point 4—the bold new program—first enunciated in his inaugural address of January 20, 1949.

By sharing our knowledge, skills, and scientific and technical assistance with the people of backward lands to combat poverty, illiteracy, and disease and to show them how to develop their natural resources we will instill self-reliance, self-respect, build the spirit of freedom, and establish a roadblock against Communist imperialism.

Another phase of this program was the legislation, passed by the House and reported in the Senate, authorizing the Export-Import Bank to use up to \$250,000,000 of its present lending authority in guaranties of American investments abroad.

This would assure private capital against loss through inability to convert earnings and capital into dollars, and against expropriation by foreign countries without prompt and adequate compensation.

Numerous important laws improving our international relations enacted by this Congress include:

First. Establishing machinery for the settlement of claims growing out of World War II.

Second. Authorizing contributions to the International Children's Fund.

Third. Strengthening our representation in the United Nations and other international organizations.

Fourth. Continuing the Institute of Inter-American Affairs.

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY

Long before the Korean crisis, the Eighty-first Congress had set about the task of preparing defenses to meet the Communist threat. In both sessions this Congress appropriated funds to aid Korea.

Legislation passed early by this House, and later approved by the Senate and signed by the President, were measures authorizing:

First. Construction of a radar air-warning and control installation at a cost of \$85,000,000.

Second. The establishment of a guided-missile proving ground for testing rockets and similar modern weapons.

Third. Improving the administration and operation of the Central Intelligence Authority—our eyes and ears around the world.

During our first session, we enacted the basic legislation for unification of the armed services within the Department of Defense. This reorganization and streamlining has overcome initial difficulties and is now operating effectively.

In addition, we provided for the creation of an Air Engineering Center, development of modern submarines, and numerous other research projects, and for the strengthening of our outer defenses in Alaska and on Okinawa.

In this second session, apart from the emergency actions already listed, we authorized the initiation of various long-term programs to build up our defenses.

The legislation continuing Selective Service registrations for another year, and giving the President authority to order inductions and to call up the National Guard and Reserves under emergency conditions, is a prime example of how closely events have pressed upon us.

This bill was passed by the House on May 24 and by the Senate on June 22. A conference was agreed to on June 26. In the meantime, over that week end, the Reds had marched into South Korea.

Upbuilding of our national defense machinery calls for both manpower and the facilities and means to operate.

The House of Representatives advocated a 70-group Air Force. Subsequently, this goal was approved.

We provided for vast programs for building of new ships for the Navy, construction of public works and housing at Army, Navy and Air Force bases both at home and abroad. A building program of armories and other facilities for the National Guard and Reserves was authorized.

In the safeguarding of our internal security, the biggest problem has been to assure protection against espionage, sabotage and sedition without infringing upon the constitutional civil rights of individuals as guaranteed under the Constitution.

Specific measures have tightened our security. Department heads of various sensitive agencies have been given authority to summarily dismiss any employee for security reasons.

A new uniform code of military justice has been adopted for all branches of the armed services, including the Coast Guard.

The provisions of the Foreign Agents Registration Act were made more stringent.

We enacted a law making it a criminal offense to reveal information about official secret codes.

As a precaution against a new "Pearl Harbor," a sneak atom bomb attack by sea or air or here at home, we provided authority for the search and control of the movements of foreign vessels entering our waters, and for control of airplanes flying over populous centers and defense areas.

#### NATIONAL ECONOMY

With passage of the Defense Production Act of 1950, this Congress gave the go-ahead signal to the executive branch to mobilize the Nation's production machinery and our whole economy to full strength.

The impact of the new defense expenditures authorized would have a serious inflationary effect unless controls were set up to safeguard our business structure. This legislation authorizes the establishment of such controls.

Broad authority is given to the President. The exercise of this power is discretionary. It is not mandatory except under certain conditions. It empowers him to impose priorities and allocations, prevent industrial hoarding, to requisition



tion materials, make or guarantee loans up to \$600,000,000 to expand production, until June 30, 1952, and to establish controls over consumer credit and wages and prices, on a selective basis, until June 30, 1951. Some of these controls have been put into effect. They have been accepted cheerfully by patriotic Americans.

A wage-price stabilization program is to be initiated on a voluntary basis. If this method fails then price ceilings and rationing may be put into effect. Wage controls are mandatory in any field where price control is imposed but not otherwise.

Special provisions are contained in the act assuring the largest possible participation of small business in the defense production program.

To help finance the cost of the expanded arms program, we have enacted a revenue measure to raise approximately \$4,700,000,000 through increases in both corporate and personal income taxes. This does not meet the entire need, but the brief interim since the Red invasion of South Korea did not permit wider action without more extensive study, and additional funds were needed immediately.

A majority of this House is strongly of the view that in a great national effort such as we are undertaking, we should draft money as well as men, profits as well as people. For that reason, we are on record by formal resolution urging our Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Finance Committee to make a survey looking toward early enactment of an excess-profits tax.

Tied in with defense needs is the law we passed extending to June 30, 1952, the Government's synthetic-rubber-manufacturing program. With the source of our imports of natural rubber from southeast Asia threatened by the global war between freedom and communism, particularly in Malaya, it was imperative that our work in this field not be discontinued when the old law expired on June 30 of this year.

Similarly vital were our actions in extending for 5 years the authority of the Government to own and lease its tin-smelter plant at Texas City, and in continuing for 3 years the Federal program for development of synthetic fuels.

We have legislated in the interest of improvement of our transportation systems, land, water, and air by authorizing a \$594,000,000 Federal-aid-for-highways program, extending the airport building program to 1953, and providing for development of our merchant marine, both seagoing and on the Great Lakes.

Further protection was afforded to bank depositors by raising from \$5,000 to \$10,000 the amount insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

This innovation of guaranteeing bank deposits by a Democratic administration which like so many other reforms we can mention was met with the cry of socialism has been tremendously effective in protecting the savings of our people and the banks themselves.

Bank suspensions and deposit losses have been insignificant since Federal insurance began 15 years ago in contrast

to the early 1930's when in 2 years more than 3,600 banks failed with losses over \$1,000,000,000 to depositors.

The present bill also provides for a return to the banks of a part of the assessment funds accumulated by FDIC and will result in reducing by about 55 percent the banks' payments.

Communities throughout the Nation are already benefitting under legislation enacted by this Congress at its first session providing \$100,000,000 for Federal aid to States and local governments in planning of public works projects. In addition a program of Federal public buildings construction and modernization in the amount of \$70,000,000 was authorized.

Important factors in maintaining a balanced economy are the laws we passed extending the President's authority to control exports and continuing his authority to control imports of fats, oils, rice and rice products. Incidentally, control over exports gives us the means to halt the flow of potential war materials to countries behind the iron curtain. The control over imports of foreign fats and oils, and so forth, aids the American farmers.

American business and industry will be greatly aided under the law passed by the Eighty-first Congress providing for dissemination by the Department of Commerce of scientific, technological and engineering information. This will be particularly true as regards small business for whose interests we have been solicitous and active.

The House of Representatives passed various bills to discourage monopolistic practices injurious to small independent private enterprise and to the consuming public. These measures proposed to tighten the antitrust laws by prohibiting acquisitions or mergers destructive of competition; to increase penalties for violations of the Sherman Act and to give the Government the right to sue for damages in Clayton Act violations.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH AND WELFARE

The most important single piece of domestic legislation enacted by the Eighty-first Congress was the revision of the Social Security Act to liberalize its terms, expand its coverage and increase its benefits.

The new law brings 10,000,000 additional persons under the old age and survivors insurance system. It means now 45,000,000 working men and women will be protected in their declining years. The new beneficiaries will include about 4,700,000 self-employed, including shopkeepers and other small-business men, a million domestic servants, and about 700,000 regularly employed farm workers. Certain professionals are expected from the self-employed group.

Other groups not now covered who will come within provisions of the new act on an optional basis are employees of State and local governments and of nonprofit organizations.

Aged persons now receiving benefits under this system will receive a substantial increase. Increases in monthly payments to aged persons now receiving

OASI checks will average 77½ percent; that is, the average payment will rise from \$26 a month to \$46.

Payment of lump-sum death benefit in all cases of insured deceased workers and many other features of the system liberalizing the formula for present and future beneficiaries were provided in this phase of the law.

World War II veterans under the old age and survivors insurance program are allowed wage credits of \$160 per month for the time spent in military service.

The OASI fund is presently supported by an equal tax of 1½ percent on both employers and employees. Under the new law this goes up to 2 percent in 1954, 2½ percent in 1960, 3 percent in 1965, and 3¼ percent in 1970 and thereafter.

In addition, the Federal Government's grants-in-aid to the States for maternal and child health services are increased from \$11,000,000 a year to \$16,500,000; for services for crippled children from \$7,500,000 a year to \$15,000,000; and for child welfare services from \$3,500,000 to \$10,000,000.

The new law also established for the first time a program of Federal grants-in-aid for the needy who are permanently and totally disabled. These persons are not included in Federal Social Security, but the Federal Government will make contributions to the States on the same basis as now provided for old-age assistance.

The Eighty-first Congress doubled the authorization for aid to States for hospital construction from \$75,000,000 to \$150,000,000 a year and authorized continuance of the program for another 4 years. The new law also liberalized the terms of these Federal grants which are made on a sliding-scale ranging from one-third to two-thirds the cost of projects, all of which must have the approval of State health authorities and the United States Surgeon General.

Another action in the interest of the health of the people is the law providing support for research and training of experts to deal with rheumatism, arthritis, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy and epilepsy and other related diseases which take a heavy toll.

Enactment of a law creating a National Science Foundation is a major contribution by this Congress to the effort to improvement of the national health and welfare. It should pay off big dividends in the long run through the development of new scientific knowledge and talent.

The Foundation by stimulating basic research and education in nearly every branch of science will enhance our ability to survive and to grow as a nation. In addition to fixing a national policy the Foundation will initiate and support basic research in the physical, biological, engineering and other sciences and will also grant scholarships and graduate fellowships and in other ways encourage scientific progress.

Overcrowded and financially embarrassed local school districts whose plight results from an influx of Government employees or defense-industry workers

will be relieved under legislation passed by this Congress.

Two programs of aid, under which it is estimated more than 600 school districts will benefit, were authorized. One will provide grants for operational costs and the other for construction of new schools. These steps, taken under legislation which safeguards the local administration and the authority over schools, are designed to compensate the districts for the burden imposed upon them by new population of Federal or defense workers' families living on property which is exempt from local taxes.

#### HOUSING

The first real long-range attack on the postwar shortage of homes was launched by the action of the Eighty-first Congress in authorizing the most comprehensive urban and rural housing program in the Nation's history.

Providing for construction of 810,000 public housing dwelling units in the next 6 years, this \$7,000,000,000 program will be financed over 40 years. Enacted over the bitter opposition of a strong real-estate lobby, this law also authorizes \$1,000,000,000 in loans and \$500,000,000 in grants to State and local agencies to help rid our metropolitan centers of slums. Veterans and families of veterans are given preference in the program.

Nearly 500 local public housing agencies are in existence in 42 States, and, upon complying with the qualifying conditions, can bring the benefits of this legislation to their respective communities.

Loans of \$300,000,000 to farmers for construction or repair of farm dwellings is provided, as well as a research program to stimulate home construction and to cut building costs.

Contrary to general impression that this legislation benefits only the larger centers of population, the fact is that America's small communities are participating widely in the low-rent public housing phase of this program.

More than half of the applications received by the Federal Housing Administration have come from local housing authorities in towns of less than 20,000 population.

Not only that, but the new program of help for farm housing is well under way. This is handled through the Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture. In the first year of this program 4,000 received loan checks totaling more than \$18,000,000 for construction or repair of homes and other buildings out of an authorization of \$25,000,000.

At its second session, this Congress passed another Housing Act, providing about \$4,000,000,000 in mortgage insurance and loan authority to encourage more home building by the so-called middle-income group.

These are families whose income is too high to qualify for accommodation in a public housing project and too low for building their own home at today's costs.

The new law provides for insurance of mortgages in connection with nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporations or trusts with permanent occupancy limited to members, and for nonprofit

corporations or trusts constructing homes for individual ownership by members.

Another new feature of this law is that it gives the Federal Housing Administration authority to give technical assistance to cooperatives in the planning, construction, and operation of their projects.

This Congress twice extended rent control on a local-option basis.

#### GOVERNMENTAL REORGANIZATION

No other administration in our history ever made such sweeping improvements in the administrative machinery of the executive departments as have been effected by President Truman under authority granted by the Eighty-first Congress.

These changes mean the elimination of many duplicating and overlapping functions. They mean time saved in operations. They mean dollars saved for the taxpayers. In short, they mean economy and greater efficiency.

The basic legislation, authorizing the President to plan a broad reorganization of departments and agencies was enacted early in our first session. It called for submission of specific plans in line with the recommendations of the bipartisan Hoover Commission appointed by President Truman.

Subsequently, he submitted to the Congress during the past 2 years 34 plans. Of these 26 have become effective under sanction of the Congress. Eight were rejected, seven by the Senate, and one by the House of Representatives.

All of the 26 plans adopted had the certified approval of the Citizens Committee for Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

In addition to those embodied in the various plans other changes were made by direct legislation. One of the major fruits of this program was the law unifying the military services. Its effectiveness is being proven today in Korea where all branches of the Armed Forces are working smoothly together to bring victory to the United Nations.

Similarly, a law streamlining the organizational set-up of the State Department has served to simplify its operations, speed up its internal communications and generally expedite the conduct of its business.

The Labor Department which, over the years had been stripped of important functions was rebuilt and strengthened to fulfill its vital role in our economic life.

Obsolete Federal budgeting and accounting methods, some of them hangovers from the days of Alexander Hamilton, were overhauled to conform with modern business practices. Under the Budgeting and Accounting Procedures Act a uniform system of Federal accounting was set up. This reform alone is estimated to save \$20,000,000 a year.

The modern, performance-type budget, adopted in this current fiscal year sets out clearly and graphically for the first time the amounts of appropriations and explains the purposes of each.

Another major improvement in the Government's housekeeping methods stemmed from creation of the General Services Administration combining into

one central agency scattered functions of purchasing, storage, and management of property and records. Savings of \$250,000,000 million a year are estimated.

Many other changes, all tending to speed up the operations of public business and reduce Government red tape have been put into effect.

#### AGRICULTURE

Two years ago the farmers of this country were suffering under a price slump in grain prices due to the failure of the Republican Eightieth Congress to remove restrictions on the Commodity Credit Corporation's power to acquire crop storage facilities.

Lacking adequate space many farmers were forced to dump their surpluses on the market during the harvesting period with the result that prices were forced down. Millions of dollars in purchasing power were lost.

Today, thanks to the Democratic Eighty-first Congress, that situation will not recur. In one of our first acts we amended the law restoring the CCC's authority to acquire the needed storage facilities.

Our legislation has made it possible for the Corporation to purchase bins bringing its storage capacity to 450,000,000 bushels and loans have been extended to farmers for purchase of their own facilities with a capacity of 50,000,000 bushels. Including additional space acquired by the Corporation in privately owned facilities a total storage capacity of 600,000,000 bushels was made available to avoid a repetition of the disastrous price-drop of 1948.

During this session, we authorized a \$2,000,000,000 increase in the borrowing capacity of the Commodity Credit Corporation to continue farm price supports of cotton, wheat, corn, rice, tobacco, peanuts, as well as of other crops.

The basic, long-range price-support program under which agriculture is operating was enacted in the first session, retaining the existing program for 1 year.

A new parity formula is to become operative for the crop years 1951 through 1953, under which some products would be supported at 80 or 90 percent at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. In some cases, the lower percentage of price-support under this new formula may be higher than 90 percent under the old, since the new formula includes the cost of hired farm labor.

The new act provides that after 1953, that is, beginning with the 1954 crop, a sliding scale of support from 75 to 90 percent under the new parity formula will become effective.

In addition to support for the six basic products the law provides for certain mandatory price supports for wool, dairy products, eggs and tung nuts. Potatoes were originally included but this year we enacted new legislation making price support of the 1950 potato crop subject to producer agreement on marketing quotas and discontinuing such support thereafter unless controls are applied.

The soil conservation program, so vital to protection of the earth from which our wealth springs, will be continued on a national basis for another two years



under legislation enacted by this Congress.

We extended and broadened the crop insurance program and authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to make production disaster loans to farmers.

We repealed the tax on oleomargarine as housewives all over the Nation so long demanded.

We increased the cotton acreage eligible for price support and made adjustments in acreage allotments to assure a fair apportionment to every locality.

This Congress authorized, for the first time, a vast expansion of rural telephone service. The Rural Electrification Administration was empowered to make 30-year loans at two percent interest to co-operative farm groups to finance new lines and to rural telephone companies for extension and improvement of their existing facilities.

This marks another great step in the whole program of the Democratic Congress and administration to make rural America happier, healthier, and more prosperous. Like rural electrification it will make life on the farm more pleasant and attractive. That program, too, is being continued.

Light and power brought into the homes of American farm families have taken the drudgery out of labor and made possible the use of innumerable labor-saving devices and various types of machinery.

Fifteen years ago when REA was begun over opposition that used the familiar label of "socialism," only 11 percent of American farms enjoyed the facilities of electricity. Today 83 percent of the farms have electric service. Only about 1,000,000 remain to be electrified. REA borrowers are operating 983 rural power systems with more than 900,000 miles of lines.

The investment made in these loans is being repaid, in dollars and in increased productivity and higher farm home values, in a higher standard of living, in greater national wealth and in more taxable income.

To prevent a recurrence of the slump in world wheat markets that followed World War I, the United States took the lead after World War II in negotiating an International Wheat Agreement. This agreement guaranteed an ample supply of bread, the staff of life, to those Nations which must import wheat and an outlet for the surplus crops of those Nations which are large producers.

As big producers the wheat farmers of the United States will enjoy a share in the world market and a stabilized price for their exported product.

Although this treaty was submitted to the Republican-controlled United States Senate on April 30, 1948, the leadership of that party majority, despite appeals by every major farm organization, by President Truman, and by the State Department, refused to approve it. At both its regular and special sessions that year, the Eightieth Congress failed to take this vital action with the result that other Nations threatened to withdraw from the pact and the plan neared collapse.

In this Democratic Eighty-first Congress the Senate ratified the agreement and both the House of Representatives and the Senate passed enabling legislation necessary to put the plan into operation.

American farms thus gained an outlet for at least 168,000,000 bushels of wheat when the program became effective on August 1, 1949, at a world ceiling price of \$1.80 per bushel.

#### LABOR

All labor is benefitting by the new law increasing minimum wages from 40 to 75 cents an hour in industries engaged in interstate commerce.

It serves as a floor under the wages of those it affects directly and as an inducement to gain higher wage levels in all forms of employment paying at sub-standard rates.

It is estimated that about 1,500,000 workers directly affected have received wage increases aggregating \$300,000,000 under this amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act which was enacted over strong antilabor pressure.

Some new groups, including workers in the fishing and canning industries, were brought under provisions of the act. In a few instances others were exempted. Numerous definitions and much-needed clarification of the overtime provisions of the law were also enacted.

Unfortunately, the Eighty-first Congress could not bring about repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, but the efforts of the Democratic leadership to do so were at least instrumental in placing into the record the stand of each individual Member upon the issue.

A great majority of the House Democrats voted for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. Election of 15 to 20 more progressive Members of the House and several more in the Senate to the Eighty-second Congress in November will bring about repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and enactment of a sound law governing labor-management relations.

Election of a Democratic Congress in 1948 prevented the enactment of even more restrictive antilabor legislation, which had been planned by Republican leaders.

The friends and foes of labor made themselves known by their votes on significant roll calls in consideration of various proposals to amend the National Labor Relations Act.

Under the policies of the majority party, the great mass of working men and women of the Nation are enjoying prosperity, and employment is at the highest peak in history today.

It must be remembered that Congress legislates for the good of the country as a whole and not in the special interest of any one group.

Every segment of population benefits from legislation for the general welfare such as the new Social Security Act, the Housing Act, and numerous other measures enacted at this session which were among the major aims of organized labor.

#### APPROPRIATIONS

Combining all regular appropriations into a single omnibus law for the first

time, this Congress provided \$33,400,000,000 to cover those budgetary expenditures.

In addition, we appropriated, in a supplemental measure, \$17,000,000,000 to provide an additional \$11,700,000,000 for our armed services needs resulting from the Korean situation, \$4,000,000,000 additional for armed assistance to our allies abroad with the balance to cover supplemental requests of the departments and independent agencies for this fiscal year.

The regular budget appropriations do not include \$6,500,000,000 made available in permanent and indefinite appropriations for servicing the national debt and various trust funds.

#### VETERANS

Mindful of the Nation's obligations to the men who served their country in time of war, the Eighty-first Congress has enacted numerous laws improving programs and procedures of the Veterans' Administration.

Additional payments of approximately \$112,000,000 are being made in disability, death, and dependency benefits to more than 2,000,000 veterans and thousands of widows and dependents under legislation passed at our first session. The rates of payment for presumed service-connected disabilities were raised from 75 percent to 100 percent and other benefits were liberalized.

Laws have been enacted permitting payment to veterans of retroactive benefits withheld during hospitalization and extending time for filing, in certain cases, for pensions and compensation.

We have provided for protection of patent rights held by World War II veterans while in the service.

The authority of the Veterans' Administration in carrying out the veterans' education program under the GI bill of rights has been redefined and clarified. In addition, the House of Representatives has authorized a select committee to investigate alleged abuses of this education and training program to assure fair treatment to the veterans and proper expenditure of the funds designated for this purpose.

Additional allowances for veterans paralyzed from service-connected brain injuries have been authorized. The law governing disability benefits for World War II tuberculosis disability cases has been liberalized by fixing the presumptive period at 3 years.

This Congress has authorized a permanent increase in Federal aid to homes for disabled soldiers and sailors in the States and Territories.

For our servicemen fighting so valiantly in Korea, our veterans of tomorrow, we have authorized the payment of family allowances to dependents of enlisted men.

Another law passed by this Congress facilitates admission to the United States of alien wives and children of veterans and servicemen by waiving racial ineligibility.

In various other measures, such as the Housing Act and Civil Service legislation, the interests of the veterans have

been safeguarded. The Congress authorized payments on automobiles for certain amputee veterans.

Both branches of this Congress approved legislation giving World War II veterans in the postal service credit toward automatic promotion for time spent in the Armed Forces. This was vetoed by the President, repassed by the House, but the Senate failed to override the veto.

Congress overrode the President's veto of the bill to provide for out-patient treatment of veterans of the Spanish-American War, Boxer Rebellion, and the Philippine Insurrection.

#### CIVIL RIGHTS

Majority party Members of the House of Representatives, I am proud to say, lived up to their pledge to support legislation for a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission.

The Republican leadership, which had made a similar pledge on this bill, failed to live up to the Republican promises and forced the acceptance of a milder version. Again, I say, election of 15 to 20 more progressive members to the House and a few more to the Senate will bring about passage of a real FEPC law in the next Congress.

The House once more voted for legislation to bar the poll tax as a qualification for voting.

Conscious of the policy of our Government to lend every encouragement to the aspirations of freedom-loving peoples, the House passed bills to authorize the admission of Hawaii and of Alaska into the Union. These bills are pending in the Senate.

Laws were enacted giving the people of Puerto Rico the right to organize a Constitutional Government and providing civil government for Guam, which had been under military rule since the end of the World War II.

#### NATURAL RESOURCES

The Eighty-first Congress lived up to the traditional Democratic Party policy of developing the Nation's resources for the benefit of the people.

We authorized numerous projects and provided funds for further utilization of water, land, and power resources, particularly in the West, where a flourishing new agricultural empire is being created on once arid lands.

Through irrigation and reclamation, through construction of reservoirs and hydroelectric dams, we are assuring the utmost beneficial use of our water resources to enrich and to conserve our soil and to create electric energy to feed and extend our power lines.

Through channel-improvement and flood-control projects, we are developing our waterways in the interest of commerce and preventing the costly waste caused by damage from rampaging waters.

The major water-resources legislation authorized future construction of flood control, rivers and harbors, and reclamation projects totaling more than \$1,700,000,000, toward which \$686,000,000 in appropriations were provided.

Definite restrictions were written into the law to assure that no new projects are begun unless it is certified by the

President that they are necessary to the defense effort. The Presidential order for a screening of all public works projects shows the Executive and the Congress to be in complete agreement in this respect.

We have authorized construction of irrigation canals to serve a quarter million acres in Sacramento Valley as part of the Central Valley project in California.

The Palisades dam and power project at Snake River, Idaho, was reauthorized and expanded.

Legislation, in a form designed to meet objections voiced by the President in an earlier veto, for construction of the Vermejo reclamation project in New Mexico, was enacted.

This Congress has authorized \$70,000,000 for a 5-year public-works program in Alaska. Its aim is to foster the settlement and increase the permanent residents of Alaska, to stimulate trade and industry, to encourage internal commerce and private investment, to develop Alaskan resources and to provide facilities for community life.

This is in addition to various military projects to strengthen defenses in this northern outpost of our Nation.

Reversing the action of the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress, funds were appropriated for the Johnsonville steam plant to provide for the power needs of the thriving region of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Over the heavy opposition fomented by the special-interest agents of the private power-utility lobby all along the line, we provided substantial funds for the Bonneville Power Administration in the Pacific Northwest and for the Southwestern Power Administration in that region. In the Southeast a new program of public-power marketing was made possible by an appropriation for this purpose. In the Northeast an investigation and report on the Passamaquoddy project in conjunction with Canada was authorized.

Legislation has been enacted for expansion of the Folsom Dam project as a step in development of the American River Basin in California. Construction of irrigation canals to serve the Sacramento Valley, as part of the Central Valley project, has been approved by the House and awaits Senate action.

The Congress has enacted a law for construction of the Weber Basin project in Utah for irrigation, water supply, flood control, and hydroelectric power for a vast area.

The Congress has renewed authority of the Agriculture Department to develop irrigation farming at Angostura, S. Dak., as part of the Missouri Basin project.

The Congress enacted authority for an irrigation and development project at Buffalo Rapids, Mont.

Various individual projects for improvements in the Columbia River area are included in the omnibus authorization bill for improvements of rivers and harbors and flood-control works.

Development of the joint Falcon Dam hydroelectric project of the United States and Mexico on the Rio Grande, in

pursuance of a treaty between the two nations, was authorized by the Congress.

Various interstate compacts for division of water rights between groups of Western States were given congressional approval.

As part of the policy of conservation, the first national survey of forest resources was authorized and a law enacted increasing Federal aid to the States in cooperative programs for forest-fire prevention. A 15-year program to recover more than 2,000,000 acres of forest land and 4,000,000 acres of grazing land was authorized.

#### CONCLUSION

The Eighty-first Congress has written on the statute books a record of high achievement.

Under Democratic leadership it has met the dual challenge imposed by international conditions: To build our defenses and to strengthen our economy.

This we have done, but at the same time we have also looked to the welfare of the great masses of our citizens, the workers, the farmers, the veterans, the small businessmen, to their security and contentment, and to the preservation of the American way of living.

We have fulfilled most of the major pledges given to the people in 1948. We have met promises with performance. We have kept the faith.

#### SALARIES OF PAGES

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 866) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That so much as may be necessary of the appropriation, "Contingent expenses, House of Representatives, miscellaneous items, 1951," is hereby made available for the payment of salaries of 50 pages for the House of Representatives, at the basic rate of \$1,800 per annum each during the period of any recess or adjournment of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Will the gentleman explain the resolution?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, because of a peculiar quirk in the wording of the appropriation act, it has resulted in this situation: A great many of the boys who are working as employees, if they happen to be on one particular payroll, for instance the Doorkeeper's payroll or the telephone payroll, they will get paid during the recess, but if they happen to be on the pages' payroll, there are about 10 of these boys who will not get paid. These boys are in school and have been in school for about a month. They cannot very well go home and go to school for 6 weeks and then come back here without being put to a great disadvantage.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Would the gentleman explain that this resolution would carry them to the time of reconvening of the Congress?

Mr. WHEELER. That is right.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. And then, after the reconvening of the Congress until the end of the session, that amount will have to be determined later.



Mr. WHEELER. The gentleman is absolutely correct in the statement he has just made.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I obtained unanimous consent to publish a report I am going to make to the Armed Services Committee. I think it will exceed the amount allowed by the rules, but I was not able to state the amount. Today, however, according to the best estimate I can give, the additional cost will be \$280. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the additional cost I may publish the entire report in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain extracts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HAYS of Arkansas addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### THE LATE GOVERNOR RALPH L. CARR

Mr. MARSALIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSALIS. Mr. Speaker, the death of former Gov. Ralph L. Carr is most regrettable. He has served the State of Colorado with distinction in a number of capacities, including two terms as its Governor. An able lawyer, he was most especially prominent in the field of irrigation and other law pertaining to water rights. In such field he was an outstanding authority. As a result of his extensive law practice and his public service, he left a large number of friends, acquaintances, and admirers, all of whom will mourn his passing. The State has indeed lost one of its outstanding citizens, one who has contributed much toward its history and well-being.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his widow and other members of his family.

#### ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I rose in opposition to an early adjournment of Congress. I said then, and I repeat, that while our boys are dying in Korea we should remain in session until the very last minute of this Eighty-first Congress. I agree wholeheartedly with the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], who said in a speech on the floor of this House yesterday:

It is not important that we win our individual election contests, but it is important that we remain on the job and pass the necessary legislation to insure victory and economic stability.

Although we are close to victory in Korea, thanks to the great fighting ability of our brave troops and the outstanding military strategy of MacArthur and his aides, we are still uncertain of what Stalin's next move may be. Our staying on the job here would hearten our boys in Korea and serve notice on the Communist aggressors that we mean business and that we are determined to mobilize our entire Nation and its economy if necessary to deliver red totalitarianism a knock-out blow. Now there seems to be a great anxiety to get back home and start campaigning. Well, I have been back in my district and I can truthfully tell you that the people are not interested in politics as usual. They know what we are up against and they think we should stay here and finish the job.

What right have we to go home before we do something about soaring prices? Why do we not stay here and pass an excess-profits tax now? Unless we do something to stem the rising cost of food, a lot of us are just not coming back here. Let there be no mistake about that. We have just raised taxes. Next month when the millions of working men and women of America get their pay checks they will find that a substantially larger deduction has been withheld. Let me tell you that in the face of food prices being higher than ever before they are not going to be very happy about that. I take off my hat to my colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. HERMAN EBERHARTER, without whose efforts we would not even have a promise that something might be done in this session about an excess-profits tax. So now we are going home to make a lot of speeches. Well, let me tell you many of those speeches are going to get a cool reception.

Although I am in disagreement with Congress recessing at this critical time I would like to point out some of the very great achievements of the Eighty-first Congress.

It is apparent that the Eighty-first Congress will take its place among the most productive Congresses in American history. In every field it has bettered American life. It has raised living standards at home by its deep concern with the welfare of all Americans. It

has safeguarded American civil liberties with its belief in the rights of the individual. And in foreign affairs it has added to the stature of the United States by its wholehearted response against the challenge of totalitarianism.

The people of this Nation gave the Democratic Party a mandate in November 1948 to eradicate the "do-nothing" policy of the Republican Eightieth Congress. History now shows that this was done. I am proud to have been a Member of the Eighty-first Congress. Confidence has been restored where previously it was in danger of disintegrating in the hands of special selfish interests. The forthright handling of the immediate problems besetting our Nation has been resumed where before delay and "do-nothingism" played into the hands of subversive forces both at home and abroad. And planning for the eventualities that lie ahead has been accomplished wisely and courageously whereas before the future was left to chance.

The legislative achievements of the Eighty-first Congress are monumental. First on the Korean front we responded immediately to fight the imperialist threat of communism. For our fighting forces we have appropriated \$16,700,000,000 additional funds for our armed services and for special military assistance to our allies in Asia to meet the Korean situation. We have not stinted where the lives of our sons and brothers are at stake.

In line with our program to increase military production we have provided President Truman with the economic controls necessary to achieve this goal. Military production comes first and our munitions industry must be assured it will be able to acquire Pittsburgh steel and other products necessary without delay. Therefore, the need of the allocation legislation of the Eighty-first Congress. Inflation controls have also been provided the President and will be used if rising price pressure develops.

We have authorized the continuation of the Marshall plan to strengthen European and Asiatic economies to withstand the Communist threat. And we have passed the North Atlantic Pact to unite the military strength of Europe and fight off Soviet aggression.

And in the international humanitarian field, we have corrected the undemocratic Displaced Persons Act of the Eightieth Congress. We have contributed to the International Children's Emergency Fund. We have extended the Institute of Inter-American Affairs to continue cooperative health, education, agriculture, and other projects to improve living conditions. Also we have begun operating the point 4 program of President Truman, which provides technical aid to underdeveloped countries so that they too may raise living standards by applying American "know-how."

In the field of national defense we have unified the Armed Forces into a team for the first time in our history. There is now one command and one order. We have authorized the reorganization of the State Department in order to modernize its structure and keep it ahead of world events. We have gone

ahead to produce the H-bomb and add to our stockpile of atomic weapons. The Eighty-first Congress provided money which made possible the great recent developments in guided missiles, radar air warnings, and snorkel submarine production. We have strengthened our intelligence organization and have tightened safeguard measures against espionage and sedition here at home. Also, we have given the President power to control foreign vessels in our waters, and have tightened the Foreign Agent Registration Act.

In the field of government organization the Eighty-first Congress has improved the structure of most agencies so that they operate today with greater efficiency and responsibility. We have also modernized Government accounting procedures so that it is now possible for the Bureau of the Budget to draw up business-type budgets for presentation to Congress.

In domestic affairs relating to the national economy, the achievements of the Eighty-first Congress are almost too numerous to list. Among the high lights are the following: We have extended rent control, the largest single item in the budget of the American family. We have authorized Federal aid to States and local governments for advanced planning of public works. We have also authorized taxing the earnings of life insurance companies which previously have utilized a loophole in the tax laws to escape such taxation. In addition, both the House and Senate have authorized increasing Federal insurance of bank deposits up to \$10,000 instead of \$5,000.

The Housing Act passed by the Eighty-first Congress is the finest housing legislation in our history. We authorized \$1,000,000,000 in loans and \$500,000,000 in grants to State and local authorities for slum clearance. Over 800,000 public housing units will be erected in the next 6 years. We also appropriated \$1,500,000 emergency funds for crippled children, in addition to regular annual grants to States, and we have continued Federal aid for schools in those communities with war-swelled populations.

Among the most notable achievements of the Eighty-first Congress was the extension of the coverage of the Social Security Act to bring over 10,000,000 more persons under old-age and survivors insurance benefits and to increase payment for all under the program. We also authorized a stepup in research into the causes and cures for rheumatism, arthritis, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy and epilepsy, and other major ailments. The Eighty-first Congress has increased the minimum wage to 75 cents an hour. And we have increased the pay and improved the working conditions of postal service employees, a group notoriously underpaid.

In the field of conservation and improvement of our natural resources, the Eighty-first Congress implemented a vast program to improve our rivers and harbors and authorized construction of flood-control projects where they were needed. A few of the other accomplishments in this field were the authoriza-

tion of aid to States for fish restoration and the establishment of experimental stations to work in the field of rare precious metals.

For our veterans the Eighty-first Congress defined the authority of the Veterans' Administration in carrying out the GI bill of rights, a program originally proposed and won by the Democratic Party. And in the field of civil rights among the achievements of the Eighty-first Congress were the establishment of a civil government for Guam, taking it from Navy control, and providing for the organization of a constitutional government by the people of Puerto Rico. The House of Representatives of the Eighty-first Congress also authorized the admission of Hawaii and Alaska into the Union as our forty-ninth and fiftieth States, as well as barring the poll tax as a qualification for voting.

In going over the record of the Eighty-first Congress, it is evident that the people of the United States have been well represented and served. The Democratic Party has again demonstrated that it is modern, far-sighted, and concerned with the welfare of all Americans.

#### SPECIAL ORDER

**THE SPEAKER.** Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

#### COTTON QUOTAS AND ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

**MR. BECKWORTH.** Mr. Speaker, I have been very interested in the situation that obtains in regard to cotton. A few days ago I was talking to a manufacturer of work clothes. He indicated the prices of these clothes are likely to go up quite rapidly. Much has been said recently about a short cotton crop. It certainly is my hope that it will not be so short that prices of these clothes will become unduly high. In my opinion one of the safeguards to assure an ample supply of cotton is to permit acreage allotments large enough that small farmers can continue to grow cotton. In some of the clippings I have seen recently it has been said that some cotton farmers have not planted their allotments. It has not been emphasized that one of the reasons is that the allotment is too small for some farmers. I desire to include certain information in regard to cotton allotments. [From the Washington Evening Star of September 22, 1950]

#### FARM OUTPUT PLANNING UPSETS SHOWN IN YEAR'S COTTON CROP (By Ovid A. Martin)

This year's cotton crop offers an example of how difficult it is to plan farm production from Washington.

A year ago the country had cotton running out of its ears. A new burdensome surplus was piling up, the bulk of it held by the Government under a grower price-support program. Uncle Sam had more than a billion dollars invested in the extreme supplies.

Today the Nation faces a possible shortage in some grades and staple lengths. Prices are advancing. Last year's so-called surplus is melting away.

#### CHIEF FACTOR IN CHANGE

What brought about this quick change? The principal factor was an Agriculture Department production-control program designed to prevent an increase in supplies.

Last year, farmers produced a bumper crop of 15,446,000 bales. This was added to a reserve of 5,283,000 bales from previous crops. "That's too much cotton," said Federal farm officials. They promptly invoked rigid production and marketing quotas designed to cut this year's crop to 11,733,000 bales. The Department allotted about 21,500,000 acres for cotton production this year, nearly 6,000,000 fewer than planted last year.

But farmers planted only about 19,000,000 acres. Some farmers did not plant their full allotments. Many had shifted to other types of farming.

On the other hand, many farmers in western areas, where cotton production has been expanding in recent years, did not get allotments as large as they desired.

#### WEATHER AND BOLL WEEVIL

On top of the underplantings came unfavorable weather in some areas and heavy boll weevil infestations and damage.

As a result, present prospects point to a cotton crop of 9,882,000 bales—or about a fifth smaller than the Government's production goal.

The supply situation wouldn't be so bad if use of cotton during the past 12 months had been in line with Government expectations of a year ago. But considerably more cotton has been used in this country and exported than had been counted upon.

The Government plans to permit farmers to grow considerably more cotton in 1951.

#### FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF GRAND SALINE,

Grand Saline, Tex., September 13, 1950.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: The newspapers and radios report that the Government is assisting cotton farmers in neighboring counties who have made a failure on cotton crops this year.

I am in the gin business and am daily coming in contact with farmers of Van Zandt who report almost a complete failure in their cotton crop.

As you know, the Government reduced the acreage this year, and the farmer has spent a lot of money for fertilizer and poison trying to make a few bales of cotton off the few acres of land which he was permitted to plant, but, due to conditions over which he had no control, he has failed.

Unless he can get some relief from some source, it is going to be a very difficult problem to finance a crop in 1951.

If there is a program helping the farmer on this present crop, we would be glad to know what the setup is.

If you will advise us in this matter, we will appreciate it very much.

Very truly yours,

SAM D. TERRY.

#### THE FARMER-STOCKMAN, Dallas, Tex., August 11, 1950.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I appreciate your having sent me recent issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD marked for reference to the agricultural legislation now under consideration. I have read the debates with as much care as time permits.

Obviously one who who is not intimately familiar with the existing law in all its details is incompetent to pass judgment on its adequacy, its equity, and its administrative workability. I do say, however, that from the very first AAA until now all such legislation and its administration has penalized



those who contributed least to the unmanageable surpluses and given the greatest benefits to those least in need of governmental aid.

I am heartily in sympathy with you and your colleagues' efforts to give the little family farmer a better deal in cotton, peanut, or other crop allotments. Permit me to question, however, that equity can ever be attained under a legal formula enacted by Congress and interpreted by the USDA.

In 1938 I worked with a committee of Texas farmers in formulating amendments to the then existing law, with a special emphasis on local authority to make individual adjustments. When the regulations were written, a county chairman claimed the county had even less authority than before. This same man later landed in Washington high in the cotton administration and his speeches in the field were typical bureaucratic gobbledegook.

I note that the Texas State committee is said to have caused a lot of trouble in county allotments, and especially in the matter of reserving too little for county and individual adjustments; that it is now proposed to make certain provisions mandatory on State and county committees instead of permissive. This may solve one problem only to create others.

The United States Department of Agriculture has always claimed that the regulatory programs are completely democratic, in that county committees are locally chosen, therefore representative of the farmers regulated. The procedure on appeals looks fine and fair on paper, but in operation the little fellow is licked before he starts, when his own county committee is hobbled by State committee and it by Federal regulations.

All this sticks out like a television antenna on a Chic Sales structure, in the recent discussions. Everybody is for decentralization of authority, but county and State committees must assume and exercise the responsibility the law provides, either permissively or by mandate.

Whether they will do so in the future, even under congressional mandate, depends on whether committees act on their own intelligence and sense of right, or whether they become indoctrinated by the bureaucratic attitude and act on its insidious guidance instead of on their own moral and intellectual integrity.

If law can put backbone into people—backbone enough to talk back to their alleged superiors and fight for their own independence in their own field of responsibility, well and good. As BOB POAGE pointed out (at p. 11421, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 31), the authority has been there but has not been exercised.

It has also been asserted (POAGE, p. 11276, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 27) that Texas was figured into a disadvantage under the so-called California gadget in a recent year. Sure, no one has either a moral or a legal right to juggle figures to evade the congressional intent, but that is nothing new in Washington. Maybe that's what their statisticians are for.

Nobody could oppose the original AAA as an emergency measure, and I supported it as such, both editorially and personally. I went along, attended hearings (required by law prior to issuing regulations for the succeeding year), and then learned that the regulations had already been written and the hearings were only a gesture to conform to law.

This is only one of the subterfuges that bureaucracy can, and has resorted to for its own ends. I could cite numerous others if it were worth while. That Washington is calling the tune is obvious from the fact that press releases with a State or local byline are the same as those with a Washington byline.

Underling employees have no choice but to parrot what their institutional superiors say; their jobs are at stake. But when the local and State farmer committeemen promulgate a mimeographed release from Washington over their own signatures—and some of them are pretty ridiculous, locally speaking—I cannot swallow it as democracy in action.

I cannot believe that many of these farmer committeemen are yes-men for the sake of the per diem they draw, or the prestige of their position. The only alternative conclusion is that they unconsciously absorb the thinking with which they are continually bombarded by the hired hands who are presumed to be the servants, not the masters, of American agriculture.

It seems to me that we need more independent thinking among grass-roots administrators, the backbone to buck the higher-ups on palpably unjust and impractical regulations, and withal the clear authority (which Poage says they already have but are not exercising.)

Back of the State and county committeemen, however, is the handbook and as one of my friends remarked, "You can't argue with a handbook."

Is there any way for Congress to fingerprint and penalize those who misconstrue or distort the legislative intent? Who write regulations and directives as they think they should be, rather than as the law provides? Who are callous to individual hardships caused by their rules and procedures? And above all, who have the "old Army game" of buck-passing beaten to a frazzle?

I am gratified to note that Texas State Administrator B. F. Vance (p. 11413, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 31) says "the most urgent need is for more flexibility in making allotments to farms." That has been the case all along, from the original AAA and Cully Cobb's administration of the cotton program to now.

When I pointed out the unfairness and economic unsoundness of applying the same percentage reduction to the small family farm already well balanced with other crops, and the all-cotton planter with large acreages, Cully's reply was, "but, T. C., if we make any exceptions it will break down the whole program." In short, the big boys won't play.

I said to him and still say that any program that perpetrates such inequities in its operation ought to break down. And this sort of thing is inherent in the historical-base principle upon which all our adjustment programs rest.

Since the historical base is made an apurtenance of the land rather than of the operator, it violates the first principles of free enterprise by placing obstacles in the way of a new farmer, and establishes prerogatives contrary to the spirit of democracy. In short, land rights supersede human rights.

Now of course we are stuck with the historical base and must try to harmonize its operation with human needs as best we can. In other words to find ways to minimize its detrimental effects on the welfare of a pretty large segment of farm families. I highly commend your efforts in that direction.

The greater flexibility that Mr. Vance urges can perhaps be had under present law and regulations; perhaps not. Certainly the inflexibility is either written into the law or interpreted into it at the national level. It comes down to State and county levels in the rulings and regulations concocted by Washington.

It occurs to me that reducing a farmer's cotton allotment to a fraction of an acre, or even a few acres as cited in several counties of your district, is nothing less than confiscation. If, under the law, he has acquired a prerogative by regularly growing cotton, it is property and the same law should not so operate as to deprive him of it.

Personally, as suggested above, I do not believe in special privileges by priority, but that is what the historical base involves, and I am realistic enough to accept it as the best we have or are likely to get soon, if ever.

So why not recognize the property rights acquired by cotton growers in good faith, permit them to sell, exchange, or otherwise derive value from whatever allotment they may receive? The man who gets too little acreage for economic operation could sell or trade his allotment to a neighbor who is equipped to use it.

The new farmer who gets too little to bother with should have the same privilege. In both cases, they should retain their status as cotton growers in order to qualify for voting on future programs.

This idea will probably be opposed by Washington, unless the present coterie of cotton officials differ radically from some of their predecessors.

Under the Bankhead Act Washington obstinately refused to permit growers to sell marketing certificates across county or State lines. In a regional AAA meeting at Little Rock, I heard the Louisiana administrator plead vainly for permission to transfer unused allotments from one part of the State to another, where they would have given needed cash income to new farms with no history.

Under vigorous needling the AAA did finally set up a regional clearinghouse for Bankhead certificates in Atlanta. Why shouldn't the individual growers have been permitted to trade directly with each other? Their acreage planted conformed to the law, nature smiled on some and frowned on others, producing an excess here and a deficit there.

All common sense and moral law favored allowing the fellow who was short of cotton to sell his marketing certificates, and the fellow who had more cotton than his marketing allowance, to buy them. That would have been some income to the unfortunates whose acres failed to produce according to Washington's "guesstimate." But that was far too simple for bureaucratic acceptance.

It seems to me that giving the allottee the privilege of merchandising his allotment if he so desires would remove some of the dissatisfaction with the program as it stands. And certainly he should not be deprived of his "cotton" franchise by not using an allotment that is obviously economically inadequate.

It is perhaps presumptuous for me to discuss the cotton program at such length. Before the 1938 act I studied legislation closely and kept well posted on the regulations from year to year. After that I realized that no man not required to do so by his duties could ever understand the laws and the voluminous details of their operation, so gave up.

Your correspondence and congressional matter to which you referred me impelled me to offer these comments, for whatever they may be worth, if anything.

I shall always welcome correspondence on agricultural matters, and shall be glad to see you when you come this way.

Very truly yours,

T. C. RICHARDSON,  
Texas Editor.

THE FARMER-STOCKMAN,  
Dallas, Tex., August 2, 1950.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have read with a great deal of interest the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS that you have sent me, and I congratulate you on your efforts in behalf of the small cotton farmer. You are quite right in saying that the allotment program robs many of those who can least afford to

lose what cotton acreage they have, as it is the most dependable source of cash income for a great many of our farm families.

As a matter of fact, the program from the first AAA has been hardest on those who contributed least to the surpluses. As long as allotments are set up on a historical base, they cannot be equitable. The farmer who has a balanced farm program, the ideal that all our agricultural agencies and the farm press have worked for, is penalized while those who planted heavily in cotton, peanuts, wheat, etc., still have enough left to make an income and they reap the major benefits in payments from the USDA.

I will be glad to see you anytime you get down to Dallas, but I want to congratulate you on sticking to the job in Washington, which your constituents hired you for. I am convinced that a public servant who attends to his job commands the respect and confidence of his constituents to a greater degree than those who politic when they ought to be attending to the business for which they were elected.

I shall be glad to hear from you at any time on agricultural affairs and especially will welcome a visit whenever you are again in Texas.

Cordially yours,

T. C. RICHARDSON,  
Texas Editor.

TYLER, TEX., July 27, 1950.

LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

Do everything possible to keep Tommie Rushing, rural route 8, box 342, Tyler, Tex., from having to plow up excess cotton planted. He misread his allotment. It is seven-tenths of an acre and he read it 7 acres. Do this for Rushing or any other farmer, for it looks like we are going to need more cotton. Code serial No. 74-212 0-33.

R. L. PRICE.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
College Station, Tex., August 3, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will reply to your letter of July 28 in which you quoted a telegram from Mr. R. L. Price, of Tyler, Tex., who wired you in behalf of Tommie Rushing, route 8, Tyler, Tex.

We had previously received a communication from Mr. Price on the same subject and referred the request to the Smith County PMA committee. It is my opinion that under existing cotton marketing quota legislation, the State committee cannot grant any relief to Mr. Rushing.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,  
Chairman, State Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Tyler, Tex., August 8, 1950.

Mr. R. L. PRICE,  
Tyler, Tex.

DEAR SIR: This is in reply to the telegrams sent to Mr. B. F. Vance, chairman, State committee, PMA, and to Mr. Jasper M. Taylor, chairman county committee, Smith County PMA regarding the excess cotton planted by Tommie Rushing.

The State and county committees do not have any authority under existing regulations and instructions to determine that the cotton allotment on the farm was unknowingly overplanted. Therefore, Mr. Rushing will need to dispose of his excess cotton acre-

age or pay the marketing penalty based on his farm marketing excess. In case the excess acreage is not disposed of properly, the other penalty provisions with respect to ACP payments and price support will be effective.

Yours truly,

DAN G. OWEN,  
Secretary, Smith County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, D. C., August 23, 1950.  
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in reply to your letter of August 14, 1950, with which you enclosed a letter from Mr. R. L. Price, of Tyler, Tex., Mr. B. F. Vance, College Station, Tex., and Mr. Dan G. Owen, Tyler, Tex., regarding Mr. Tommie Rushing's farm on which the 1950 cotton-acreage allotment was overplanted.

As pointed out in our letter of August 16, 1950, and in a telephone conversation on August 17 with a member of the cotton branch, regarding Mr. Rushing's case, there is no authority in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, under which the 1950 cotton acreage allotments and quotas were established, for adjusting the acreage allotment established for a farm for the purpose of bringing the planted cotton acres within the allotment. Neither is there any authority, contained in the act, by which an individual can be relieved of compliance with the program provisions arising because he misread or misinterpreted certain provisions of the act or the Secretary's regulations issued thereunder.

As requested in your telephone conversation there is enclosed Agricultural Conservation Programs Memorandum 136, which pertains to knowingly overplanted cotton farms.

Sincerely yours,

C. J. McCORMICK,  
Under Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Montague, Tex., April 19, 1950.  
Re letter dated April 12, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
Third District, Texas,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The cotton allotments for Montague County are small. Our final county factor being .0987.

We have 470 farms with 5 acres or less.

We had 139 applications for new grower cotton allotments. Only 100 acres was set aside for these applicants. These 139 new producers received allotments from 0.5 to 2.7 acres. One hundred and fourteen of the 139 received less than 1 acre. None of the 139 new growers received a zero acreage.

We estimate that 86 percent of these new producers are genuine farmers.

Yours truly,

JAMES B. ZETZSCHE,  
Secretary, Montague County PMA.

P. S.—Montague County has 2,318 farms, with only 881 eligible for cotton allotments. You will note above that 470 of these have less than 5 acres. J. B. Z.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Mason, Tex., April 21, 1950.  
LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: In regard to your letter dated April 12, 1950, please find listed below the information you ask for:

In Mason County, we have 124 cotton farmers. Out of this 124 there are 95 farmers that received 5 acres of cotton or less.

We had 20 new producers to apply for a new growers cotton allotment and we had 25 acres to distribute among the new producers. The acreage they received ran as low as 0.4 acre and as high as 2.4 acres. Eight out of the 20 received less than 1 acre. These 20 new growers all received some cotton acreage, none receiving zero acreage. We regard 100 percent of the new producers as genuine farmers.

Yours truly,

WILLIE MAE SCHREIBER,  
Secretary, Mason County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Dickens, Tex., May 9, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Enclosed are answers to the questions asked in your letter of May 6, 1950. Hoping this is the information requested.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE H. CARTER,  
Secretary, Dickens County PMA.

Number of cotton producers in county: 873.  
Number of farmers received less than 5 acres cotton: 12.

Number of new producers that applied for acreage: 38.

Acreage to distribute among new producers in county: 1,417.9.

No. of acres each got:

A-87	55.0
A-94	26.4
A-114	36.3
A-121	5.5
A-152	34.5
A-153	13.8
A-178	6.0
A-369	30.1
B-47	9.7
B-65	13.4
B-85	8.8
B-119	43.6
B-120	40.0
B-131	24.8
B-143	16.7
B-165	37.3
C-69	16.2
C-87	3.8
C-130	27.1
C-138	24.4
C-154	26.5
C-167	3.8
C-205	10.7
C-232	6.2
C-244	22.7
C-251	61.0
C-295	49.1
C-296	11.9
C-304	42.9
C-315	3.8
C-344	15.4
C-347	30.3
C-363	4.7
C-381	17.0
C-416	17.7
C-418	18.0
C-433	11.7
C-463	24.1

Total ----- 850.9

Number that received zero acres: None.

Percent of new producers I regard as genuine farmers: 100 percent.

Acres the recent cotton amendment helped new producers: Zero.

Acres the recent cotton amendment helped old producers: 105.6.

Number of producers receiving less than 5 acres that probably will grow no cotton: None.

Number that will cease to farm for themselves: None.



PITTSBURG, TEX., April 13, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: I'm mailing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS back to you. We read rather minutely the RECORDS and not your valiance stand for our interest. PMA's or Agriculture Department tabulated those years during the war period when our sons were entering the war machinery or more vital work than the farms. All-out winning that war. Parents were buried in grief and some passed on. And for 2 years the Mr. was in such poor health as an aftermath of the war. We refused to let him farm, 1946-47. Now believe you me, this harness, those PMA and Agriculture Department are putting us in are the tightest yet. But right is might. And all wrong will be dealt with summarily, positively.

Sincerely,

J. D. MARTIN.  
EDNA MARTIN.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Hillsboro, Tex., May 8, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of May 6, 1950. Listed below you will find the answers to the questions concerning 1950 cotton allotments in Hill County. We have 4,039 cotton producers in Hill County and 157 received less than 5 acres. Had 79 producers that applied for new-growers allotments. There was 1,700 acres that was set aside for the new producers in our county. They each received the allotment they requested not to exceed 35 percent of their cropland. None received zero acres. All of the new producers are regarded as genuine farmers. The recent cotton amendment did not help any new producer. The amendment gave the old producers 55 acres. There will be at least 30 percent of producers that received less than 5 acres that will grow no cotton, and 10 percent will cease to farm for themselves. There are 4,039 for 1950, for previous years unknown, probably about the same amount.

Trust this is the desired information you requested.

Very truly yours,

CLINE T. YOUNG,  
Secretary, Hill County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
McKinney, Tex., May 8, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of inquiry dated May 6, 1950, the following information is submitted:

1. Number of cotton producers in Collin County: 4,132.
2. Number of farmers who received less than 5 acres: 192.
3. Number of new cotton producers who applied for cotton acreage: 92.
4. Number of acres distributed to new cotton producers: 955.9.
5. Number of acres each new cotton producer received: 25 percent of cultivation acres after deduction of their wheat allotment.
6. Number of zero acres cotton allotments issued to new producers: None.
7. Percentage of new producers which we regard as genuine farmers: 75 to 85 percent.
8. Number of acres distributed to new cotton producers under recent legislation amendment: None.

9. Number of producers receiving less than 5 acres that will probably plant no cotton: 15.

10. Number of producers receiving less than 5 acres that we estimate will cease to farm for themselves: None.

P. L. BARKSDALE,  
Secretary, Collin County ACA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING,  
ASSOCIATION,  
Bay City, Tex., May 9, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Enclosed you will find a tabulation of the information requested by you in your letter of May 6, 1950. Some of the information you requested is still unavailable to us, but we are glad to help you with what information we do have.

I sincerely hope that this report will be satisfactory to you.

Yours truly,

CARL E. LIVELY,  
Administrative Officer, Matagorda  
County, PMA.

1. How many cotton producers are in your county: 788.
2. How many farmers in your county received less than 5 acres of cotton: 129.
3. How many new producers applied for acreage: 90.
4. How much acreage was there to distribute among the new producers in your county: 400.
5. How much did each get? (Limited by county factor, .2740): 3.8 to 20.
6. Did any receive zero acreage: Yes.
7. What percent of the new producers do you regard as genuine farmers: 77 percent.
8. How much in acres did the recent cotton amendment help your new producers? [Blank.]
9. Your old ones: 629.5.
10. How many of your producers receiving less than 5 acres will probably grow no cotton: 11.
11. How many will cease to farm for themselves? [Blank.]

WILLS POINT, TEX., May 15, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

DEAR SIR: Mr. BECKWORTH, as Congressman of this Third District of Texas, I am writing you to ask that you will please get Congress to prepare a "soup line" for me beginning about October 1, 1950.

The cause of this condition is as follows: I live on a 78-acre rented farm with 30 acres in crop land. Said farm being rented cash rent in advance, which is the best way to rent "at least I think so." The 3-A office in Canton say I can plant 2.2 acres of cotton which is a fraction over 1/15 of the crop land.

Sir, I kept off all WPA in the past. I "lived hard" in the "Hoover Days" but 2.2 acres in cotton out of 30 in crop land will force me on a soup line.

I am living on my forty-seventh year of life, too old now to get a job. I did not go to school long enough to get a "position" and have rheumatism too bad to dig ditches with a pick and spade.

Hoping you are o. k.

I am respectfully,

H. T. HOLLIDAY.

THE FIRST STATE BANK,  
Ben Wheeler, Tex., May 20, 1950.  
Mr. B. F. VANCE,  
Chairman, State Committee,  
College Station, Tex.

DEAR SIR: There are six farmers, to wit: T. B. Thornburgh, L. D. Thornburgh, John Thornburgh, Tom Shirey, Bill Webb, and

Ronald Mitchell, and they are on a farm of 960 acres, 400 acres of cultivatable land. Also a Mr. Gordon Gilchrist on a 97-acre tract of land, of which three-fourths is tillable land, but 5 miles from the above 960-acre tract of land. These seven men were given 4 acres of cotton land.

The first four above-mentioned men cannot read or write and are honest, hard-working men with good-sized families.

Why can't these men get enough cotton acreage to be worth while?

Why cannot the Van Zandt office be investigated?

We await your reply.

Yours truly,

C. L. YOUNGBLOOD.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,

Athens, Tex., April 14, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
Member of Congress,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of April 3, 1950, this is to advise that approximately 800 farms received less than 5 acres of cotton for 1950. We had 455 new producers who filed for a new grower's allotment. The 455 new growers received a total of 259.3 acres, which averaged from 0.1 to 1.5 acres. None of the new growers received a zero allotment. Ninety percent of new growers in this county are genuine farmers.

Yours very truly,

RAYMOND G. MAGERS,  
Chairman,  
Henderson County PMA Committee.

TYLER, TEX., June 2, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This comes to say that I received my 1950 cotton acres allotment yesterday, June 1, 1950. Mr. BECKWORTH, I want you to know that I really appreciate to the highest extent of what you have done for me in aiding me in getting my cotton allotment.

I shall do everything in my power to get the people in this county to vote for you in the next election and I do hope to see you when you come to this county. The board gave me 6½ acres of cotton, and oh, how glad I am to get that number of acres, for I am so deep in debt I want to pay my debt and cotton was the only means I had to pay them.

I mailed you a letter May 31, 1950 asking you to write my PMA committee, but I have received my allotment since I wrote you, so please cancel that letter, and do not write them to mail it to me.

Thank you again and again. Hoping you and family a happy, prosperous, and long life. May God ever bless you and put his arms of protection around you.

I am still sick, not able to do anything. Wife and children are well.

I am,

Your friend,

DAVID SMITH.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Goldthwaite, Tex., April 18, 1950.  
Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: This is with reference to your letter of April 12, in which you requested certain information pertaining to cotton acreage: 168 farms in our county received 5 acres or less cotton; 62 producers applied for new allotments; 50 acres were allotted to our county for new

allotments; 1.3 acres per hundred acres of cropland were allocated. All producers were genuine farmers.

Yours very truly,

LESTON F. BAIN,  
Secretary, Mills County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Conroe, Tex., April 19, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In regards to your letter of April 11, 1950, there were 150 farms that received 5 acres of cotton or less. There were 105 new producers that applied for acreage. There were 114.9 acres to be distributed to new growers. The highest acreage for a new grower was 3.8 acres and the lowest acreage was 0.3 acre. There were 36 producers 0.0 out. There are about 75 percent of the new producers that we regard as genuine farmers.

If we can be of any assistance to you, please let us know.

Yours very truly,

M. J. ROSS,  
Secretary, Montgomery County PMA  
Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Stephenville, Tex., April 18, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.,

DEAR SIR: This is a reply to your letter of the twelfth relative to cotton farmers in Erath County.

There were 632 farmers who received 5 acres or less of cotton allotment and quite a number additional that received a 5-acre-plus allotment. There were 170 farmers applied for a new grower allotment and all of these men received a 1.1-acre allotment except 5, and these ranged from 2- to 6-acre allotments. There were approximately 25 others that applied but when told that there were more applicants than we had acres to distribute they withdrew their requests. No one received a zero allotment. The county committee feels that approximately 90 percent of these farmers are genuine farmers.

Yours very truly,

FRED N. CAREY,  
Chairman, Erath County PMA  
Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Fairfield, Tex., April 19, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your request of April 5, I am herewith giving you the following information from the files of the Freestone County PMA office.

1. Number of farms which received a 5-acre cotton allotment or less: 527.
2. Number of new producers applying for an allotment: 84.
3. Number of acres held in reserve by the county committee for new producers: 400.
4. The allotments for these 84 producers range from 0.5 acre to 19.6 acres.
5. Number of new producers receiving a zero allotment: None.
6. Would estimate that 90 percent of these are genuine farmers.

I trust this is the information you desire.

Yours very truly,

NORMAN H. LAMBERT,  
Secretary, Freestone County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Madisonville, Tex., April 18, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of April 5, 1950, we are giving you the following information:

The number of farmers in the county receiving 5 acres of cotton or less: 248.

The number of new producers that applied for cotton acreage: 123.

The amount of acreage there was to be distributed among new producers in the county: 342.9.

The new producers received from 0.7 of an acre to 8.5 acres.

None received zero acres.

About 75 percent of the new producers are regarded as genuine farmers.

Yours very truly,

JIMMIE W. WOOLEY,  
Secretary, Madison County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Canton, Tex., April 18, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is to advise that approximately 340 applicants were disqualified by the county and local committee-men for various reasons.

Since you have lived in this area you must know that the land here on an average will not produce over 125 to 150 pounds per acre. You must also realize that the farms that are applying for a new-grower allotment in the main are below this average or they would have been farmed during the base years.

In the opinion of the county committee, an allotment of less than 5 acres on a farm in this area is almost useless. In view of these facts and because there was only 427.7 acres of cotton to be issued to approximately 600 applicants, the committee felt it necessary in all fairness to everyone involved to disqualify all producers who did not have work stock and equipment, had a substantial cotton allotment on another farm, actually made their living from some other source than farming, or for some other reason were not dependent on having a cotton allotment for their livelihood, asked for an allotment on land not adapted to cotton, or requested an allotment on farms so small that allotment procedure would not allow them an allotment large enough to be of any use to them, or on a farm so large and farmed with large equipment which would have made the small allotment available of no use to them. Even after this the highest new-grower allotment in the county is 4.5 acres, and only five or six farms received this allotment. The average new-grower allotment in this county is approximately 1.7 acres. It is our opinion that not over one-third of the 243 new-grower allotments issued by this county will be planted. They will not be planted because they are too small to be of any use to the person receiving them. If all applicants had been approved, it is our opinion that not one of these allotments would have been planted.

R. W. BROWN,  
NED L. CHEATHAM,  
J. M. STEPHENS,  
County Committee,  
Van Zandt County, PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Jasper, Tex., April 18, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
Member of Congress,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In compliance with your request dated April 12, we are listing below the information called for.

The number of farmers in Jasper County receiving 5 acres of cotton allotment or less was 387.

The number of new growers applying for allotments was 76.

There were 84.2 acres available for distribution to new growers.

These allotments ranged from 0.2 acre to 4.1 acres.

No farms received a zero allotment.

We regard at least 90 percent of our new growers as genuine farmers.

We hope this is the information desired in your request and at any time we may be of further assistance, please call on us.

Yours truly,

CHARLIE L. CARTER,  
Secretary, Jasper County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Ballinger, Tex., April 18, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In answer to your note of April 12, 1950, we are happy to furnish the following information pertaining to 1950 cotton allotments in Runnels County:

Number of farms in Runnels County that received 5 acres of cotton or less: 26.

Number of new grower applications: 65.

Number of acres to be distributed among new growers, 1,512.8.

Percent each new grower received: 25.

Did any receive zero acres: No.

Percent of the new growers regarded as genuine farmers: 100.

If we can be of further assistance to you, please do not hesitate to call on us.

Yours very truly,

S. E. CLONINGER,  
Secretary, Runnels County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Newton, Tex., April 17, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of April 12, 1950, inquiring about the cotton situation in Newton County, we find from the records in this office the following:

1. How many farmers in county receive 5 acres or less? Answer: 308.
2. How many new producers applied for acreage? Answer: 77.
3. How much acreage was there to distribute among new producers? Answer: 69.7.
4. How much did each get? Answer: It would be difficult to answer this question, but they range from 0.1 acre to 4.1 acres for new growers and 1.0 to 11.7 acres for the old growers.
5. Did any receive zero acres? Answer: No.
6. What percent of the new producers do you regard as genuine farmers? Answer: It will be impossible to give you an intelligent answer on this question. You may use the above information to get an answer.



Hoping that this will answer your questions and if we can at any time help you we want you to feel free to call on us.

Yours very truly,

MARLIN E. BORDERS,  
Secretary, Newton County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Hamilton, Tex., April 17, 1950.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In response to your letter of April 12, we have compiled the following:

1. Two hundred ninety-one farmers in Hamilton County received cotton allotments of 5 acres or less.

2. Sixty-three new producers applied for acreage.

3. There were 150 acres to distribute among these new producers.

4. Each new producer got an allotment ranging from 0.6 to 6.9 acres—57 of these being 5 or less.

5. No new producer received a zero allotment.

6. In regards to the percentage of new producers who are genuine farmers, they are all considered as diversified cotton farmers.

Respectfully yours,

JIM F. GILBREATH,  
Administrative Officer,  
Hamilton County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Tyler, Tex., April 18, 1950.

MR. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
Member of Congress,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LINDLEY: This is in reply to your letter of a few days ago in which you requested answers to the following:

How many farmers in Smith County receiving 5 acres or less: 1,387.

How many new producers applied for a cotton allotment: 450.

How much acreage was there to distribute among the new producers of Smith County: 607.

How much did each get: Average 1.

Did any receive zero: None.

What percent of the new producers do you regard as genuine farmers?: 100 percent.

The 450 producers that made application as new growers are all old cotton growers, but for 1950 they are on farms that had no cotton history for 1946, 1947, and/or 1948 which made it necessary that they make application as a new grower.

Hoping this to be the desired information, I am,

Yours truly,

DAN G. OWEN,  
Secretary, Smith County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Brownfield, Tex., July 7, 1950.

Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: We regret to have delayed in answering your letter of May 8, however, at the time we received your letter we were reworking all allotments in the county to conform with what we call the 65-45-40 amendment.

We will endeavor to answer your questions in the order in which you ask them: 1382; 9; 39; the new growers received the same factor as the old ones, which was .3040 except those where in the opinion of the county committee the new grower was not entitled to the same factor as old growers because of the

XCVI—592

history of the farm or the topography of the soil, etc.; none received zero allotments; all new grower allotment applications which we received were genuine farmers in the opinion of the county committee or they did not receive an allotment at all; new growers, none; old growers, approximately 3,000 acres; none unless weather conditions are so that they cannot plant.

Very truly yours,

LOOE MILLER,  
Secretary, Terry County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Jacksboro, Tex., July 7, 1950.

MR. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We will now furnish information on letter of May 8, relative to the cotton allotment conditions in Jack County.

We have about 260 cotton producers in Jack County. Thirty-nine of these received less than 5 acres, twenty-six of which were new growers.

Thirty-four applications for new growers all received as much as 3.8 acres up to 15.3 acres from reserve of 170 acres set aside for new growers. All new growers were genuine farmers, living on the farm or another one near. Some had not grown cotton in several years. Therefore no history for old farms.

Under the amendment Public Law 471, the county was given 595.1 acres with 41.1 acres by appeal. This justification through the county committee having been compelled to reduce the farmers' reported acreage to come within the BAE figures.

There are always a few farmers who ask for a new grower cotton allotment and fail to get their acreage planted. This same condition applies on both wheat and peanuts. For instance, last fall we had 10 new grower wheat allotments and only 4 were seeded.

We are very largely a cattle country but always have a few who depend on cotton, peanuts and wheat for a cash crop.

It seems to our county committee that the cotton allotment law 272 does not do justice to the already diversifying farmer who has already set up a crop rotation system to take care of and build his soil; having already cut his cash crop to the minimum to save the soil.

We were talking to a PMA administrative officer from the Texas plains country this week who had gotten a factor of 0.5803 per cropland for his county. While here we got a factor of 0.1248. We could live with a factor of 0.20 or 0.25 of cropland and to bring some of the larger factors back to 0.40 would help a lot of small factored counties.

We see no reason why a more equitable law cannot be worked out and not hurt anyone.

We hope that information given here will be helpful.

Very truly yours,

W. E. YOWELL,  
Secretary,  
T. D. WILLIAMS,  
Chairman,  
EVERETTE B. ABERNATHIE,  
Vice Chairman,  
HERSHELL E. EICHLER,  
Member,  
Jack County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Tilden, Tex., June 29, 1950.

Representative LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter dated May 8, 1950, on cotton producers and allotments

in McMullen County, we have listed below your questions with our answers on same:

How many cotton producers are in your county: 75.

How many farmers in county received less than 5 acres of cotton: 1.

How many new producers applied for acreage: 5.

How much acreage was there to distribute among the new producers in county: 66.6.

How much did each get: 5.4, 5.8, 30.9, 20.6, 3.9 acres.

Did any receive zero acres: No.

What percent of the new producers do you regard as genuine farmers: 5.

How much in acres did the recent cotton amendment help your new producers: 0.

Old ones: 306.3.

How many producers receiving less than 5 acres probably will grow no cotton: 1.

How many will cease to farm for themselves: none.

Very truly yours,

C. H. TEAL,  
Chairman, PMA County Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Cameron, Tex., June 29, 1950.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Reference to your letter of May 6, 1950, concerning information on cotton acreage and producers in Milam County, we are listing as follows:

1. How many cotton producers are in your county: 2,500.

2. How many farmers in your county received less than 5 acres of cotton: 264.

3. How many new producers applied for acreage: 134.

4. How much acreage was there to distribute among the new producers in your county: 341.3.

5. How much did each get: From 0.5 to 31.7.

6. Did any receive zero acreage: 3.

7. What percent of the new producers do you regard as genuine farmers: 90 percent.

8. How much in acres did the recent cotton amendment help your new producers: 183.2; (a) old producers, 3,152.5.

9. How many of your producers receiving less than 5 acres probably will grow no cotton: 50.

10. How many will cease to farm for themselves: 100.

Yours very truly,

ALVA E. SANDERS,  
Administrative Officer, Milam County  
PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Sweetwater, Tex., June 29, 1950.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of May 8, 1950, the following information is from Nolan County, Tex.:

This county has 774 cotton producers; 7 of these producers received less than 5-acre allotments; 25 new producers applied for new grower cotton allotments; there was 200 acres to distribute among new producers in this county; the 14 new producers received from 5- to 30-acre allotments; the 11 applicants receiving zero allotments were not considered bona fide cotton farmers.

The cotton amendment did not help any of our new producers, but the old producers received 2,647.5 additional acreage.

Probably none of the seven producers who received less than 5-acre allotments will grow

any cotton, however the cotton-acreage survey for Nolan County is incomplete at this time.

We have not been advised at this time that any of our farmers will cease to farm for themselves.

Very truly yours,

DEMP KEARNEY,  
Secretary, Nolan County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Hondo, Tex., June 29, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Complying with your request of May 6, 1950, we enclose information concerning cotton farmers and acreages for Medina County.

Yours very truly,

JAMES M. RATLIFF,  
Secretary, Medina County PMA.

1. Number of cotton producers in this county: 91.
2. Number farmers receiving less than 5 acres of cotton: 56.
3. Number new producers applying for acreage: 50.
4. Number acres available to distribute among new producers: 58.
5. Number acres each got: 1 to 2.6.
6. Number receiving zero acres: None.
7. What percent of the new producers do you regard as genuine farmers? 100 percent.
8. Number acres new producers were helped by recent cotton legislation: None.
9. Number acres old producers were helped by recent cotton legislation: 90.6.
10. Number producers receiving less than 5 acres that probably will not grow cotton, in my opinion: 20.
11. Number producers that will probably cease to farm for themselves: None.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Belton, Tex., June 30, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In reply to your request for certain information pertaining to cotton acreage allotment, however, there are list our answers in the order of your request.

There are 3,107 farms that received a 1950 cotton acreage allotment, however, there are a number of farms with several tenants who produce cotton.

One hundred and fifteen farms received less than 5-acre allotments.

Approximately 100 farms requested a group II allotment. We had 546 acres to distribute to new producers.

The acreage varied from 1 acre to 25 acres. Some received a zero allotment because they had been farming for years and never planted cotton.

We doubt that more than 10 percent of those requesting a new grower allotment could be regarded as genuine farmers.

The recent cotton amendment helped Bell County by 3,938.1 acres, this went to old growers. The amendment did not help new growers.

We doubt that over 25 percent of the 5-acre or less allotment farms will grow cotton.

Our guess is that approximately 5 percent will quit farming for themselves.

We trust that this information will be of some value to you.

Yours very truly,

A. J. PETERS,  
Secretary, Bell County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Mount Pleasant, Tex., April 14, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
Member of House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This acknowledges your letter of April 3, 1950.

Question No. 1. How many farmers in your county received 5 acres of cotton or less: 508 farms.

Question No. 2. How many new producers applied for acreage: 129.

Question No. 3. How much acreage was there to distribute among the new producers in your county: 172.1 acres.

Question No. 4. How many new producers received zero (0) new grower allotments: 72.

Question No. 5. What percent of the new producers do you regard as genuine farmers: Under the regulations and the knowledge had on each farm, 44 percent were considered eligible for consideration for new grower allotments. Because of the limited amount of acreage available for new growers, and due to the fact there was a great number who desired new grower allotments, they did not get the factor for the county as established for group I farms, but rather received .9237 percent of the factor of .1339 would have given them.

In other words, their allotments were figured in the same manner as group I farms with the exception that they only received 0.9237 percent. Actual farm visits were made on each of the new grower applications before any allotments were considered. Many of the applications for new grower allotments were for the purpose only of helping to rent their farms. Such allotments were not given consideration by the committee. Those who did receive allotments were those farmers who qualified on the four points, namely, that they live on the farm, that they had adequate livestock and equipment, that they did not have cotton allotment on another farm, that no agreement, written or oral, had been made, and that they need the allotment in order to make a living.

I trust this gives you the desired information.

Yours very truly,

HARRIS A. GREEN.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Emory, Tex., April 12, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
Member of Congress,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: There are 116 group I farms, that is, farms on which cotton was grown, or considered as grown, during the base years 1946, 1947, and 1948, which have allotments of 5 acres, or less.

There were 131 new growers allotments established for 1950, totaling 884.8 acres. This county had ample reserve set aside to give these applicants the county factor of .2201, or their requested acreage whichever was the smaller, except that a minimum of 3 acres was established, unless the producer requested a smaller acreage.

We think that probably 75 percent of the acreage allotted will be planted.

Our small farmers are not materially affected by allotments, as compared to the actual cotton growers. In reducing our reported figures to BAE estimates (which we doubt as even nearly accurate) our farmers are not benefited by the amended legislation except through appeal to a review board to restore their original reported acreages.

In view of this situation we hope that if there is any way you can help facilitate the function of appeal committees in reviewing these cases you will do so, for the time is short and farmers don't want to plant an

acreage with the possibility of having to destroy it, should be the appeal committee reject their claim. We will need more committees to hold these hearings, than have been appointed; in fact, I believe every county affected by this legislation should have a review committee set up. Rains County alone will probably have 200 appeal cases to dispose of and this is a small county compared to most of the east Texas counties affected.

Any assistance you render will be very deeply appreciated by every cotton grower and agricultural worker in the South.

Yours very truly,

ELTON B. SHIVERS,  
Administrative Officer, Rains County  
PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Carthage, Tex., April 11, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of April 3, 1950, addressed to the Panola County PMA Committee, has been referred to me for reply. Below your questions are listed with our reply.

1. How many farmers in your county received 5 acres of cotton or less? Answer: Group I, 570; group II, 364; total 934.

2. How many new producers applied for acreage? Answer: 397.

3. How much acreage was there to distribute among the new producers in your county? Answer: 1,000 acres.

4. How much did each get? Answer: The 1,000 acres was distributed by factor and cropland basis.

5. Did any receive zero acres? Answer: Yes; one.

6. What percent of the new producers do you regard as genuine farmers? Answer: 100 percent.

Very truly yours,

T. L. VINCENT,  
Secretary, Panola County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Canton, Tex., April 11, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: The county committee has requested that I give the following answers to the questions asked in your letter of April 3, 1950.

1. Six hundred and forty-two farms received 5 acres or less in Van Zandt County.

2. Approximately 600 farmers made application for new-grower allotments.

3. There was 427.7 acres of cotton to distribute to new-grower farmers in this county.

4. Each farm which received an allotment received from 0.4 acre to 4.5 acres. The allotments averaged 1.7 acres.

5. It was necessary that a considerable number be given a zero allotment.

6. The committee regards approximately 70 percent of the applicants genuine farmers.

Very truly yours,

JAMES C. HODGE,  
Secretary, Van Zandt County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Lufkin, Tex., April 10, 1950.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In regard to your letter of March 3, 1950, the following are correct quotations of cotton acreages in Angelina County, Tex.



We had 424 group 1 (old farm) cotton allotments, and of this number 90 farms received less than 5 acres per farm. The total for this 90 farms was 279.9 acres. We had 290 group 2 (new farm) cotton allotments, and only 1 of these allotments exceeded 5 acres, and that allotment was 5.2. The remaining 289 received allotments of one-tenth up to 4.9 acres. The 290 new-farm allotments only totaled 344.8 acres.

In my opinion all the new producers could be classed as genuine farmers, and it is the feeling of my county committee that something should be done in order to increase the cotton acreage for these new farmers. From all indications the group 1 farmers are fairly well satisfied with their allotments; therefore, the county committee of this county would like to use released acreage to supplement new growers.

We all appreciate the interest you have shown toward the small cotton farmers, and any time we can be of assistance to you please call upon us.

Very truly yours,

LEON D. PLEDGER,  
Secretary, Angelina County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Hemphill, Tex., April 10, 1950.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: There were 331 farmers in Sabine County who received 5 acres of cotton or less; 116 new producers applied for acreage: 165.3 acres were available to distribute to new growers.

New allotments ranged from 0.2 to 6 acres. Only those having some interest in a group I allotment got zero for group II application.

I believe that 90 percent of the new producers are genuine farmers.

Yours truly,

H. H. MINTON,  
Secretary, Sabine County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Longview, Tex., April 11, 1950.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LINDLEY: We have 321 group I farmers receiving allotments in Gregg County. Of this number 161 received allotments of 5 acres or less; 100 allotments were between 5 and 10 acres, and only 11 allotments were above 40 acres.

We had 146 acres to be divided among 83 new producers. Seventy received allotments between 1 and 2 acres, 11 between 2 and 5 acres, and 2 between 2 and 8 acres. None of the new growers received over 8 acres, and no one received zero allotments. I think all who applied for new grower allotments were genuine farmers.

Very truly yours,

J. W. BULLOCK,  
Secretary, Gregg County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Quitman, Tex., April 10, 1950.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in reference to your letter of April 5, 1950, to the county committee.

1. The number of farmers receiving 5 acres of cotton or less was 1,248.

2. The number of new producers that applied for allotments was 340.

3. The acreage that was available to distribute among the new producers was 300.

4. Each producer received from 1 acre to 1.1 acres.

5. The number of zero allotments was 10.

6. The percent of new producers regarded as genuine farmers was 88 percent (300 applications).

The number applications left from item 2 less item 5, less item 6, consisted of 30 applications that did not meet the necessary eligibility requirements.

If you desire further information, please advise.

Yours very truly,

ROY E. BARNETT,  
Secretary, Wood County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Gilmer, Tex., April 11, 1950.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is in answer to your letter dated April 5, 1950.

Three hundred and twenty farms in group 1 received less than 5 acres cotton allotments.

One hundred and fourteen farms in group 2 (new growers) received less than 5 acres.

Two hundred and seventy farmers filed applications for new grower cotton allotments. Only 116 applications out of the 270 applications received cotton allotments; 254.6 acres were distributed among 116 farms. Rather small, isn't it? Averaged about 2.1 acres to the farm. I would think all are farmers.

This office has been accepting applications for adjustment in cotton allotments, under the bill passed recently by Congress. To date, we have checked 211 applications filed and only 35 out of the 211 applications will be helped any by the 65-45 provision of the bill. We are disappointed that it will not help more farms. Since many are not helped by the 65-45 provision the county committee is hoping the release provision will help, if it ever gets out to county offices.

Very truly yours,

LEWIS E. STRACENER, JR.,  
Administrative Officer,  
Upshur County, PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Jefferson, Tex., April 10, 1950.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LINDLEY: I would like to make the following report in answer to your letter of April 3, 1950.

We have 787 applications with 222 receiving above 5 acres allotment, 351 receiving 5 acres allotment and 214 receiving less than a 5-acre allotment.

We have 116 group II farms with only 47 receiving allotments, the other 69 receiving no allotments. Out of the 47 that did receive an allotment, 2 farms got 1 acre each, the others getting 2 acres each with the exception of 3. Of those three, one received 3.5, one received 4-, and the other received 5-acre allotments. Only 99 acres were set aside for group II farms in Marion county.

The 69 applicants which received no allotments are farmers who say they cannot accept less than 5 acres or already have an allotment on other farms.

Marion County is in the group where nearly all the small sawmills are having to close and all workers have returned from defense jobs and there is no other recourse but to go farming. As you will note we have a number of 5 acre or less allotment farms. Due to the fact that husbands were off at defense

plants and sawmills this small acreage was carried on by other members of the family.

With these small allotted acre farms it is impossible for the farmers to receive help from the bank or any other lending agencies.

In reference to the 45-65 amendment we have seven applicants thus far receiving help. Five of these received less than four-tenths of an acre and the other two received 2.4 and 3 acres.

We would appreciate anything that can be done to help the farmers of Marion County.

Very truly yours,

WALTER C. RALPH,  
Administrative Officer, PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Mount Vernon, Tex., April 12, 1950.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This is in regard to your letter of April 4, 1950.

There was a total of 299 farms in Franklin County that received 5 acres or less cotton allotments. This includes the old cotton farms and new farms that received 5 acres or less.

There was a total of 83 producers who filed an application for a new grower allotment. Of these 67 received an allotment and 21 received a zero acres. Of the total applicants we feel that about 85 percent of them are genuine farmers.

Very truly yours,

H. LUMMIE WILLIAMSON,  
Chairman, Franklin County  
PMA Committee.

CELINA, TEX., May 25, 1950.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Well, the cotton allotment was supposed to be increased, but I did not get any more as they said I had 2 acres more than I was due. You remember the chief from the station said I seemed very well satisfied. I did say that, "I got a very fair allotment to what some got." I meant those poor east Texas sandy land farmers that got from 2, 3, 5 acres.

I have my little farm rented out. The allotment of cotton is 15 acres. That gives me 3.34 acres, 9 acres of wheat, that gives me 3 acres. And the big cotton plantation farmers can plant 1,500 to 5,000 acres cotton, and the wheat farmer can sow 1,900 to 5,000 acres or more in wheat. I still say it is not fair nor just and is a dirty rotten ignorant deal. There is nothing just or fair the way it is figured.

I think all farms with 100 acres and less should be allowed to plant as much as one half in cotton, if he so desires; but no farmer should be allowed to plant over one half of his land in any major crop, such as wheat, corn, or cotton. The big farmer could plant one half of his first hundred in cotton, that would give all farmers an even start. Every other 100 acres until the Government has the right amount in cotton. The way it is figured now, the little farmer is being starved out and the big-land farmer and holder is being paid a bonus for having big farms in cultivation.

If he wants a tank dug the Government pays the most of the cost, and if he wants it terraced the Government pays the most of that. They pay him \$100 an acre to mow his pasture the first time in the spring or summer, and a little less the rest of the season, when he wants it mowed, while he has a big herd of white-faced cattle on the pasture. While thousands of small farmers are lucky if they have pasture for a milk cow or two, and no mowing to be done. The

way the allotments are figured now the little farmer cannot feed and clothe his family.

The reason I don't think the small farmer should plant over half of his land in cotton, I know from my own observance, that some ignorant narrow-brain fellow will plant from 75 to 90 percent in cotton, and try to buy everything they eat, and never have a thing left, and if only allowed to plant one half in cotton he can raise some corn, potatoes, feed, raise his own meat, chickens, a garden and other truck patches, raise most all his living at home and have his cotton money left to buy clothing and necessary things, maybe pay for a home, in time.

Well, you know one of the experts said, "Those poor sandy land farmers in east Texas where they were allotted so small cotton acreage, they could go in the cattle business." "That it was an ideal place to raise cattle." How is a man on a small poor sandy land farm of say, 100, 60, 50, or 40 acres or less going to start a cattle ranch, when he is lucky if he has enough pasture for a milk cow, or a goat? Besides, it takes money to buy good breeding stock, and fence the pasture. I don't think I ever heard of a more silly or ignorant suggestion, while the big west Texas land owner is breaking out as fine a grassland as there is, and planting it in cotton, or sowing it in wheat.

If this farm program was put on a sane and sensible plan, it could be handled with one fourth the number of helpers and save millions in cost. This fiddling dillying, and measuring, and all silly stuff, telling the farmer while the ration is on, how much of each crop he is allowed to plant, and if he is found overplanting, make it a heavy fine with no Government support, would in my estimation be much fairer. You remember one of the big chiefs wanted all the farmers taken off the submarginal land and put him on some kind of work, and let the big farmer raise the food. I think that was one of the most silly and ignorant statements a man could make. For any man on a small run-down farm with 8 to 10 kids is better off on any fair-producing farm than in a town; because he is not qualified for any good paying job. One of the main men in the top A office, told my tenant that the cotton allotment was not fair as it is written now, that it was for the big man. If the narrow-brain farmer would try to raise their living, instead of trying to raise something to sell, it would not be the mess it is. If the little farmer did not have some savings, we would have to sell our little farms under the present rule. The big chief never did say why they allowed more cotton where you did not sow any wheat. But said they were doing an expert business in conserving the soil. That just smells of Irish potatoes to me. If it cannot be adjusted any better than that, I hope that they will junk the whole farm program.

I hope that you win in all your fights. I aimed to write you long ago but didn't want to take up your valuable time. I wanted to express my ignorant views and say what I thought about the whole mess. I never thought of inferring to the chief that I was satisfied with the program at all.

I am glad to be counted as your friend, for I sure appreciate your kind friendship. I hope you got your record back; I sent them sometime back.

Your friend and well wisher,

J. O. WOLFE.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
Linden, Tex., May 22, 1950.

Mr. WAYLON NELSON,  
Atlanta, Tex.

DEAR WAYLON: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 18, 1950, request-

ing information on the cotton farmers of Cass County.

The following information is being furnished and is based on a careful estimate of the records on file in this office.

Cass County is made up of 4,800 work-sheet farms; 2,600 of these farms were given a 1950 old-grower cotton allotment based on 0.1584 percent of the cropland on the farm if the farm had been planting as much or more than this percentage factor applied to the cropland, otherwise the farm received 100 percent of the highest planted cotton acreage during any one of the base years 1946, 1947, or 1948. Under the cotton law, 1949 does not enter into the picture for establishing allotments.

The 0.1584-percent factor was arrived at by dividing the total cropland (150,000 acres) on the above 2,600 farms into the county cotton allotment (24,200 acres) less 100.0 acres reserve for the correction of errors, and so forth, less 1,500 acres reserve set aside for new grower allotments.

A new grower farm is a farm on which no cotton has been planted during the base years 1946, 1947, or 1948 and who intended to plant cotton in 1950. Each new grower had to make application for an allotment by not later than February 28, 1950.

Six hundred Cass County farmers made application for new-grower allotment for their farms. So you see, 600 applications with 1,500 acres to allot would amount to approximately  $2\frac{1}{2}$  acres per farm, but under the law this 1,500 acres had to be allotted on the bases of cropland on the farm adjusted downward to the 1,500 acres.

This made some new growers get an allotment of 1.8 acres. The county and community committeemen reviewed each new grower application and estimated 20 percent or 120 of the 600 applications were genuine farmers, the balance being landowners, requesting an allotment in order that he might have a chance to rent his farm.

The recent cotton amendment did not help our farmers very much. We had 1,200 applications for more cotton but the amendment applied to these farms helped approximately 300 and then to the tune of a total 1,000 acres. The amendment did not apply to a new grower since it was based on the larger of 65 percent of his 3-year (1946-48) average or 45 percent of the highest planted acres during any one of the base years, not to exceed 40 percent of the cropland on the farm.

Waylon, I have tried to give you a picture of the 1950 cotton allotment situation in Cass County and if I can be of further assistance please feel free to call on me.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT L. WILLIAMS,  
PMA Administrative Officer, Cass County.

TYLER, TEX., June 15, 1950.

HON. GENE WORLEY,  
Member of Congress,  
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: It is too late to do anything to aid the situation this year but we do want to bring to your attention some conditions which exist among small cotton farmers in this part of the country.

To be specific, I have a farm which was cultivated in a manner during 1946 and 1947. April of 1948 the tenant died. The crop he had started was never finished. This tenant had planted about 15 acres of cotton each of these 2 years and perhaps more cotton was planted all years prior to 1946. During the later part of 1949 I was fortunate enough to find someone who wanted to cultivate the old farm which is located in Macogoches County. A Mr. Leslie Smelley and Mr. Roy Wade, who were without cotton allotments on the little farm they own, wanted to rent this place. They had every reason to believe they would be given at least 60 percent of the 1946 and 1947 cotton acreage.

About May 20, which is 1 month late for cotton planting in east Texas, they were advised by the local board, one member of which board is a boyhood friend of mine, that the place had been allotted two-tenths of 1 acre. These boys are cultivating other crops on my farm and a small amount of cultivation is being done on their own little farms. They simply cannot stay out there on those farms with this amount of cotton and they have no other cash crops. It is a serious proposition for them and it is for them that I make this appeal.

Frankly, I would not care one straw if no cotton was planted on my place, but I cannot rent the farm to anyone without some cotton acreage. This is a serious matter with the few remaining farmers in that once prosperous community. Most farms are now abandoned which, of course, has destroyed a number of schools, churches, and other rural activities.

I am unable to understand why this farm was not allotted at least 60 percent of the acreage planted in cotton during what we understand to be the basic years going back to 1946. Perhaps some Government regulation is necessary but frankly the one as now administered is driving the few remaining small farmers from the soil into the towns. These farm lands are being bought up by the wealthier city dweller. To me this is an unhealthy and dangerous situation even though I am now a city dweller and love the soil and perhaps would reach out and add more acreage to my present holdings. It would be far better to have these larger farms divided up and suitable homes made there for many of the families who are crowding into the cities.

It is needless to go on with the picture. You must know about it already. We trust the coming year will find something done that will at least be in the direction of correcting the evil and restoring these people back to the farms where somehow and under some condition they must finally go if our economy is to survive.

We trust you will give the matter earnest and careful consideration.

Very truly yours,

B. T. WALTERS.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,

Benjamin, Tex., July 28, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Here is an informative report in answer to the questions in your letter of May 8, 1950:

1. How many cotton producers are in your county: 1,350.
2. How many farmers in your county received less than 5 acres of cotton: 33.
3. How many new producers applied for acreage: 47.
4. How much acreage was there to distribute among the new producers in your county: 1,271.9 acres.
5. How much did each get: Total, 754.2 acres.
6. Did any receive zero acres: Yes.
7. What percent of the new producers do you regard as genuine farmers: 80 percent.
8. How much in acres did the recent cotton amendment help your new producers: None.
9. The old ones: 27.8 acres.
10. How many of your producers receiving less than 5 acres probably will grow no cotton: None.
11. How many will cease to farm for themselves: 0.5 percent.

Very truly yours,

BENNETT P. HAMAN,  
Secretary, Knox County PMA Committee.



DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING  
ADMINISTRATION,  
San Benito, Tex., August 9, 1950.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is with reference to your letter of May 6, 1950, concerning farmers and cotton data in Cameron County.

In connection with this information we must apologize for this rather late reply to your letter. As you will readily understand, all available personnel in the county office have been engaged to the limit attempting to complete cotton performance work, whereby marketing cards could be issued to eligible producers in the county. We are happy to advise that the job has been completed, with the exception of one or two cases.

With reference to your letter and the information desired, we offer the following:

1. There are approximately 6,279 cotton farms in Cameron County.

2. Five hundred and fifty of these farms received less than 5-acre cotton allotment.

3. Five hundred and eighty-nine new producers applied for cotton acreage.

4. The county committee's reserve for distribution to new growers plus the allotment from the State office, amounted to 3,738.9 acres.

5. Each group II or new farm containing less than 500 acres net cropland received 20 percent of such cropland as an allotment. Farms containing over 500 acres received 15 percent of net cropland as an allotment.

6. There were no farms applying for a group II allotment which received zero acres.

7. It is estimated that only 40 or 50 percent of these group II producers could be termed as genuine farmers.

8. The amendment to the cotton law did not help farmers in Cameron County as the county cropland factor was 4653 percent. The amendment limited the farm to 40 percent. The reapportionment provision helped one group II farm in the county. The total acreage released by the reapportionment provision amounted to 2 acres.

9. It is estimated that approximately 10 percent of the farms receiving less than 5-acre allotment grew no cotton in 1950.

10. It is believed that 30 to 40 percent of these under 5-acre farms will cease to farm cotton. The assumption is based on the fact that several of the small group II farms had previously been planted to citrus and due to the severe freeze in January of 1949 the orchards were removed. Many orchards have been replanted and when the trees reach a substantial size no cotton will be planted on the farm.

In connection with cotton in Cameron County, your attention is called to the fact that there are areas in the county that contain what is strictly known as cotton land. These farms do not successfully produce vegetables and citrus. This type farm has for the past 6 or 7 years planted straight cotton on the entire farm. As a result of the marketing quota law this type farm has been cut 50 to 54 percent. As can be realized a 30-to-40-acre farm, of which we have many, has suffered a severe reduction in potential income.

Any assistance that you might give farmers in this area will be greatly appreciated.

Hoping this is the information you desire and if we can be of any further service please contact us.

Yours very truly,

H. R. HILL,  
Secretary, Cameron County PMA  
Committee.

#### FEDERAL AID TO HOSPITALIZATION

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, it has been called to my attention that the Budget Bureau is intending to reduce the amount that Congress voted for aid to hospitals in communities. As I recall, we voted the sum of \$150,000,000 for aid to hospitals. The Budget Bureau intends to reduce it 10 percent. If this is done, it seems to me we are going to welsh on our agreements with these small communities which, depending on the action we took several months ago, have already made contracts to build necessary additions.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. I yield.

Mr. PACE. I fully share the concern of the gentleman from Michigan about that appropriation. The gentleman will recall, however, that final decision lies with the President of the United States. The President has declared that he regards the health of the American people as next in importance to peace, and I hope very much he will not concur in the recommendation that will reduce the Hill-Burton appropriation.

Mr. SHAFER. I feel just as does the gentleman from Georgia.

#### THE DUTY OF CONGRESSMEN

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, it seems to be popular to make fun of Congressmen for wanting to get home to campaign. The papers say Congress should be on the job, and say that means staying in session in Washington. I agree that Congressmen should be on the job, but the job of a Representative of the people involves not only being in Washington, but being home.

I do not think elections are a necessary evil, to be ignored or deprecated in times like this, since they cannot be postponed. I glory in the fact that under our system we have our regular elections in times of stress, war, or crisis. But to have fair and intelligent elections the people ought to see and hear the candidates. The people's representatives should be home answering questions, telling about Washington, telling what they have been doing, and why; what they stand for, and why. This is an important part of the job of a representative in a republic.

So I say to my colleagues as they hurry home to their districts, I cannot hope you will all be elected, but I can hope that all of you do this part of your job well; that you tell what has gone on in Washington fairly, intelligently, and intelligibly; that you tell where you stand, and why; that you answer the questions the people ask about this great Republic and its workings. If you do that, you will be Congressmen on the job.

We leave work unfinished here, but the work of lawmaking in a republic is

never finished, and unless some further emergency arises can wait until we complete the unfinished business of helping to have free, intelligent elections.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I am very much concerned about some representations being made in respect to the effect of the appropriation bill that was passed, particularly pertaining to appropriations for the administration of the social-security program.

I hope that when the Congress reconvenes on November 27 the Appropriations Subcommittee on Social Security will immediately look into this subject because it concerns so very many people throughout the country.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a report from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech I made that may run beyond the allotted cost. Notwithstanding that fact, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD (at the request of Mrs. DOUGLAS) was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. CARROLL (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) was given permission to extend his remarks and include certain articles and speeches and to insert a title of a speech in connection with the so-called McCarran bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include excerpts from committee reports on a bill recently considered by the House.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1025. An act for the relief of Waymon H. Massey;

H. R. 6355. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Richmond, Calif.;

H. R. 5327. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1951, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5372. An act to authorize the negotiation and ratification of separate settlement contracts with the Sioux Indians of Cheyenne River Reservation in South Dakota and North Dakota for Indian lands and rights acquired by the United States for the Oahe Dam and Reservoir, Missouri River development, and for other related purposes;

H. R. 8920. An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 516. Joint Resolution authorizing the President, or such officer or agency as he may designate, to conclude and give effect to agreements for the settlement of intercultural conflicts involving enemy property.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 450. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by providing for the delegation of certain authority of the Secretary of Commerce and of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, and for other purposes;

S. 3504. An act to promote the development of improved transport aircraft by providing for the operation, testing, and modification thereof; and

S. 3960. An act to amend subsection (b) of section 10 of the act of June 26, 1884, as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 599 (b)).

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6319. An act to authorize a \$75 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 7824. An act to provide for the administration of performance-rating plans for certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9526. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes; and

H. Con. Res. 286. Concurrent resolution recalling the enrollment of H. R. 1025 for correction.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with House Concurrent Resolution 287, the Chair declares the House adjourned until Monday, November 27, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1681. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Carmen Pardo De Tavera De Gonzalez or Carmen Gonzales, file No. A-6192285 CR 27821, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1682. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the act of Congress approved July 1, 1948 (Public Law 863), amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)), to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1683. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service granting the application for permanent residence filed by the subjects of such orders, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JUDD: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 2496. An act to authorize contributions to Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 3136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 9756. A bill to grant free postage to members of the Armed Forces while confined for treatment in a military or naval hospital, and to veterans while being furnished hospital treatment or institutional care in institutions operated by or under contract with the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 9757. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to provide automatic insurance and other benefits for certain servicemen injured or killed in a train collision on September 11, 1950, at or near Lafayette, Ohio; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 9758. A bill to protect the internal security of the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities and to provide for the emergency detention of persons who may commit acts of espionage and sabotage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. COMBS:

H. J. Res. 546. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the opening of Spindletop oil field; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. Res. 867. Resolution to provide for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7789); to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVENPORT:

H. R. 9759. A bill for the relief of Thomas Schaeuermann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIES of New York:

H. R. 9760. A bill for the relief of Marantonia Francovilla Franco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 9761. A bill for the relief of Mihai Handrabura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 9762. A bill for the relief of Piotr Kowalczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.